

Proof[chapter]  
**KU LEUVEN**

**ARENBERG DOCTORAL SCHOOL**  
Faculty of Engineering Science

# Termination and Non-termination in Logic Programming

**Dean Voets**

Dissertation presented in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of Doctor in Engineering

December 2013



# Termination and Non-termination in Logic Programming

**Dean VOETS**

Examination committee:  
Prof. P. Van Houtte, chair  
Prof. D. De Schreye, supervisor  
Prof. F. Piessens  
Prof. M. Bruynooghe  
Prof. F. Mesnard

(faculté des sciences et technologies (université  
de la Réunion))

Prof. W. Vanhoof  
(Institut d'informatique (Université de  
Namur))

Dissertation presented in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for  
the degree of Doctor  
in Engineering

December 2013

© 2013 KU Leuven – Faculty of Engineering Science  
Uitgegeven in eigen beheer, Dean Voets, Celestijnenlaan 200A box 2402, B-3001 Heverlee (Belgium)

Alle rechten voorbehouden. Niets uit deze uitgave mag worden vermenigvuldigd en/of openbaar gemaakt worden door middel van druk, fotokopie, microfilm, elektronisch of op welke andere wijze ook zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de uitgever.

All rights reserved. No part of the publication may be reproduced in any form by print, photoprint, microfilm, electronic or any other means without written permission from the publisher.

ISBN 978-94-6018-777-3

D/2013/7515/158

# Dankwoord

Dit proefschrift, *Termination and Non-termination in Logic Programming*, bevat de belangrijkste resultaten van mijn onderzoek naar de analyse van eindigheid en oneindigheid in Logische Programmeertalen. Dit werk werd uitgevoerd binnen de groep Declaratieve Talen en Artificiële Intelligentie van het Departement Computerwetenschappen aan de Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven. Zonder hulp had dit werk niet tot stand kunnen komen. Het is dan ook vanzelfsprekend dat ik begin met het bedanken van diegenen die de grootste steun zijn geweest om mijn doctoraat tot een goed einde te brengen.

Eerst en vooral zou ik de promotor van mijn doctoraat, Prof. Dr. Danny De Schreye, willen bedanken. Ten eerste voor het gestelde vertrouwen zodat ik aan mijn doctoraat heb mogen beginnen. Ten tweede voor zijn uitstekende begeleiding, waardoor ik veel heb bijgeleerd over communicatie, presentatie en ook de formalisatie van de bestudeerde onderwerpen.

I would like to thank the members of the jury for reading and evaluating my PhD. Your remarks have been most useful to obtain this final version of my thesis. I would like to thank the chairman of my jury Prof. P. Van Houtte, my promotor Prof. D. De Schreye, my assessors Prof. F. Piessens and Prof. M. Bruynooghe and the external jury members Prof. W. Vanhoof and Prof. F. Mesnard.

Vervolgens zou ik graag mijn collega Dr. Paolo Pillozzi bedanken voor zijn steun en vriendschap tijdens ons onderzoek aan de Katholieke Universiteit Leuven en voor de inspiratie die uit onze gesprekken voortvloeide door zijn eigen kijk op de zaken.

Tenslotte zou ik graag mijn ouders, Jan Voets en Leen Van de Weerd, bedanken voor hun vertrouwen en jarenlange steun. Het is door jullie dat ik ben kunnen uitgroeien tot de persoon die ik vandaag ben en daar ben ik jullie enorm dankbaar voor.



# Abstract

One of the central concerns of declarative programming is that it leads to less error-prone, more understandable and better maintainable programs. However, it is well-known that a declarative programming style also results in less efficient computations, and in the extreme case, in non-terminating computations. The latter problem has received considerable attention within the community. Much research has been done on termination analysis, loop detection and more recently, non-termination analysis.

Due to the nature of undecidability, there must be situations in which neither a termination proof nor a non-termination proof can apply; i.e., no sufficient termination/non-termination conditions are satisfied so that the user would get no conclusion. We observe that in such a situation, it is particularly useful to compute an approximate conclusion indicating possible termination or possible non-termination. To the best of our knowledge, however, no existing approximation approach was available before our work.

A first contribution of the thesis is the development of such an approximation approach called termination prediction. In the case that neither a termination nor a non-termination proof is applicable, we appeal to an approximation algorithm to predict possible termination or non-termination. The analysis constructs a finite symbolic derivation tree, representing the derivation for a class of queries. The termination behavior is then predicted by checking properties of this tree.

A second contribution of the thesis is a new non-termination analysis for logic programs. In the thesis, we define a non-termination analysis based on the symbolic derivation trees from the termination prediction approach. We show that this non-termination analysis improves on the results of the only non-termination analyzer developed before our work. We extend our non-termination analysis in several ways. Type information and use program specialization is incorporated to obtain a stronger non-termination analysis. Another extension

we discuss, is an extension to handle programs using integer arithmetics. We implemented this non-termination analysis and we show its applicability on a benchmark of logic programs.

A final contribution of the thesis is the development of a termination analysis for the programming language Constraint Handling Rules (CHR). This termination analysis is the first approach without restrictions on the type of rules in the CHR program. We demonstrate the condition's applicability on a set of terminating CHR programs, using a prototype analyzer. This analyzer is the first in-language automated termination analyzer for CHR programs.



# Beknopte samenvatting

Een van de belangrijkste voordelen van declaratieve programmeertalen is dat het toelaat om beknopte, verstaanbare programmas te schrijven die makkelijk te onderhouden zijn en minder gevoelig zijn fouten. Het is echter ook geweten dat zo een declaratieve stijl van programmeren kan leiden tot onefficiënte programmas en in het ergste geval zelfs tot oneindige berekeningen. Dit probleem heeft veel aandacht gekregen in de onderzoeksgemeenschap. Er is veel onderzoek gebeurd naar technieken om eindigheid voor programmas te bewijzen (terminatie analyse), technieken om lussen te detecteren tijdens de uitvoering (lus detectie) en meer recent, technieken om oneindigheid van programmas te bewijzen (non-terminatie analyse).

Doordat de analyse van eindigheid voor programmeertalen onbeslisbaar is, moeten er situaties zijn waarbij noch de eindigheid, noch de oneindigheid van een programma bewezen kan worden. In zo een geval krijgt de gebruiker dus geen conclusie. Daarom is het volgens ons nuttig om een benaderende analyse uit te werken. Wanneer exacte terminatie en non-terminatie technieken geen conclusie geven, kan de benaderende techniek gebruikt worden om een afschatting van de eindigheid van het programma te maken. Deze benadering kan dan helpen om het programma verder aan te passen totdat een traditionele analyse de eindigheid of oneindigheid kan bewijzen.

Een eerste bijdrage van de thesis is de ontwikkeling van zo een benaderende analyse genoemd *eindigheids voorspelling*. Wanneer de eindigheid van een programma niet exact kan worden bepaald, gebruiken we een algoritme om een benaderend antwoord te zoeken. De analyse stelt een eindige, symbolische boom op die de berekening voor een klasse van queries voorstelt. Vervolgens worden er eigenschappen van deze symbolische boom onderzocht, om zo een benaderende conclusie over het eindigheid gedrag van deze queries te bekomen.

Een tweede bijdrage van de thesis is de ontwikkeling van een nieuwe non-terminatie analyse. In de thesis definiëren we een nieuwe analyse die de

symbolische boom van de eindigheids voorspelling zal gebruiken om te bewijzen dat de uitvoering van een programma niet zal eindigen. We tonen aan dat onze analyse preciezer is dan de enige andere geautomatiseerde non-terminatie analyse. We breiden deze techniek op verschillende manieren uit. Type informatie en specializatie wordt gebruikt om een betere analyse te verkrijgen. Daarnaast bespreken we een uitbreiding van deze techniek die toelaat om programmas te bestuderen die rekenkundige predikaten bevatten.

Een laatste bijdrage die in de thesis wordt besproken is de ontwikkeling van een terminatie analyse voor de programmeertaal Constraint Handling Rules (CHR). Deze terminatie analyse is de eerste eindigheids analyse die geen beperking legt op het soort regels dat gebruikt mag worden in het programma. We tonen aan dat de analyse van toepassing is op een heel aantal eindigende CHR programmas, met behulp van een prototype analyzer. Deze analyzer is de eerste terminatie analyzer voor CHR die de programmas rechtstreeks, dus zonder vertaling naar een andere programmeertaal, onderzoekt.

# Contents

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| <b>Abstract</b>   | <b>iii</b>  |
| <b>Contents</b>   | <b>vii</b>  |
| <b>List of Figures</b>  | <b>xi</b>   |
| <b>List of Tables</b>   | <b>xiii</b> |
| <b>1 Introduction</b>   | <b>1</b>    |
| 1.1 The Termination Problem in Logic Programming . . . . .                          | 1           |
| 1.2 Overview and goals of the Thesis . . . . .                                      | 2           |
| <b>2 Preliminaries</b>  | <b>9</b>    |
| 2.1 Logic Programming . . . . .   | 9           |
| 2.1.1 Loop Checking . . . . .   | 12          |
| <b>3 Termination Prediction for General Logic Programs</b>                          | <b>13</b>   |
| 3.1 A Characterization of Infinite SLDNF-Derivations for Concrete Queries . . . . . | 15          |
| 3.2 A Characterization of Infinite SLDNF-Derivations for Moded Queries . . . . .    | 16          |
| 3.3 An Algorithm for Predicting Termination of Logic Programs . . . . .             | 24          |

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 3.4      | Experimental Results . . . . .                                  | 35        |
| 3.4.1    | Pruning . . . . .   | 36        |
| 3.5      | Related Work . . . . .  | 38        |
| 3.6      | Summary . . . . .   | 40        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Non-termination Analysis for Logic Programs</b>              | <b>41</b> |
| 4.1      | A new non-termination condition . . . . .                       | 42        |
| 4.1.1    | The moded more general relation . . . . .                       | 42        |
| 4.1.2    | Non-termination of moded more general loops . . . . .           | 44        |
| 4.1.3    | Input-generalizations . . . . .                                 | 46        |
| 4.2      | Experimental evaluation . . . . .                               | 50        |
| 4.2.1    | <i>P2P: from Prediction to Proof</i> . . . . .                  | 50        |
| 4.2.2    | Benchmark of Termination Problems . . . . .                     | 50        |
| 4.2.3    | Comparison with <i>NTI</i> . . . . .                            | 52        |
| 4.3      | Summary . . . . .   | 53        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Non-termination Analysis for Logic Programs using Types</b>  | <b>55</b> |
| 5.1      | Preliminaries . . . . .   | 57        |
| 5.1.1    | Types . . . . .   | 57        |
| 5.1.2    | Non-failure analysis and program specialization . . . . .       | 58        |
| 5.2      | Moded-Typed SLD-trees and the <i>NFG</i> transition . . . . .   | 59        |
| 5.2.1    | Moded-typed SLD-trees and loop checking . . . . .               | 59        |
| 5.2.2    | The <i>NFG</i> transition . . . . .                             | 61        |
| 5.2.3    | Correlation with concrete queries . . . . .                     | 62        |
| 5.3      | Typed non-termination analysis with non-failing goals . . . . . | 64        |
| 5.3.1    | Non-termination of inclusion loops . . . . .                    | 65        |
| 5.3.2    | Input-generalizations . . . . .                                 | 66        |
| 5.3.3    | Program specialization . . . . .                                | 69        |

|          |  |            |
|----------|--|------------|
| 5.4      | Summary . . . . .  | 71         |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Non-termination Analysis for Logic Programs with Integer Arith-</b> | <b>73</b>  |
|          | <b>metics</b>  |            |
| 6.1      | Integer arithmetics . . . . .  | 74         |
| 6.2      | Non-termination of the Logic part . . . . .                            | 74         |
| 6.2.1    | Moded SLD-tree for programs with integer arithmetics .                 | 74         |
| 6.2.2    | Adapting the non-termination condition . . . . .                       | 77         |
| 6.3      | Non-termination of the Integer part . . . . .                          | 81         |
| 6.3.1    | Proving that the constraints on integers are solvable . .              | 83         |
| 6.4      | Evaluation . . . . .   | 86         |
| 6.5      | Summary . . . . .  | 87         |
| <b>7</b> | <b>Termination Analysis of CHR</b>                                     | <b>89</b>  |
| 7.1      | Introduction . . . . .   | 89         |
| 7.2      | Preliminaries . . . . .  | 90         |
| 7.2.1    | Constraint Handling Rules . . . . .                                    | 90         |
| 7.2.2    | Termination Analysis . . . . .   | 93         |
| 7.3      | A new termination condition for CHR . . . . .                          | 94         |
| 7.3.1    | Ranking Condition (RC) for CHR with substitutions . .                  | 95         |
| 7.3.2    | Ranking Condition for CHR . . . . .                                    | 97         |
| 7.4      | Automation and experimental evaluation . . . . .                       | 102        |
| 7.4.1    | Experimental evaluation . . . . .                                      | 106        |
| 7.5      | Summary . . . . .  | 108        |
| 7.5.1    | Later works on Termination analysis of CHR . . . . .                   | 108        |
| <b>8</b> | <b>Conclusion</b>  | <b>109</b> |
| 8.1      | Symbolic execution . . . . .   | 110        |

|                             |            |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| <b>Bibliography</b>         | <b>113</b> |
| <b>Biography</b>            | <b>119</b> |
| <b>List of Publications</b> | <b>121</b> |

# List of Figures

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| 2.1  | The generalized SLDNF-tree $GT_{G_0}$ of $P_0$ . . . . .   | 11 |
| 3.1  | A framework for handling the termination problem . . . . .   | 14 |
| 3.2  | The generalized SLDNF-tree $GT_{\leftarrow p(X)}$ of $P_1$ for a concrete query $p(X)$ . . . . .             | 17 |
| 3.3  | The moded-query forest $MF_{p(\mathcal{I})}$ of $P_1$ for a moded query $p(\mathcal{I})$ . . . . .           | 17 |
| 3.4  | The moded generalized SLDNF-tree $MT_{p(\mathcal{I})}$ of $P_1$ for a moded query $p(\mathcal{I})$ . . . . . | 19 |
| 3.5  | (a) $MT_{Q_0^1}$ , (b) $MT_{Q_0^2}$ , and (c) $MT_{Q_0^3}$ . . . . .   | 23 |
| 3.6  | Two moded generalized SLDNF-trees of $P_3$ generated by Algorithm 3.1. . . . .                               | 29 |
| 3.7  | The moded generalized SLDNF-tree of $P_4$ generated by Algorithm 3.1. . . . .                                | 31 |
| 3.8  | The moded generalized SLDNF-tree of $P_5$ generated by Algorithm 3.1. . . . .                                | 32 |
| 3.9  | The moded generalized SLDNF-tree of $P_6$ generated by Algorithm 3.1. . . . .                                | 33 |
| 3.10 | The moded generalized SLDNF-tree of $P_7$ with a moded query $p(\mathcal{I}, 0)$ . . . . .                   | 34 |
| 3.11 | SLDNF-derivation of Example 3.12 with pruning . . . . .  | 37 |

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
| 4.1 | Moded SLD-tree for the <i>binary tree</i> program, using <i>LP – check</i> with repetition number 2 . . . . . | 46 |
| 4.2 | Moded generalized SLDNF-tree with LP-check of <i>flat</i> (Example 4.5) . . . . .                             | 47 |
| 4.3 | Input-generalized SLDNF-derivation of <i>flat</i> . . . . .   | 49 |
| 5.1 | Moded-typed SLD-tree for the atom <i>longer</i> , using <i>LP – check</i> with repetition number 2 . . . . .  | 60 |
| 5.2 | Moded-typed SLD-tree with <i>NFG</i> of the <i>longer</i> program . . .                                       | 62 |
| 5.3 | Moded-typed SLD-tree of Example 5.8 . . . . .   | 62 |
| 5.4 | Moded-typed SLD-tree of Example 5.10 . . . . .  | 67 |
| 5.5 | Input-generalized derivation . . . . .  | 67 |
| 6.1 | Moded SLD-tree <i>count_to</i> . . . . .  | 75 |



# List of Tables

- 3.1 Predictions: full table available at [2] . . . . . 36
- 3.2 Pruning: full tables available at [2]. . . . . 38
- 3.3 Comparison between TPoLP and (non-)termination analyzers. 38
  
- 4.1 Benchmark of non-terminating pure logic programs. . . . . 51
  
- 6.1 An overview of the experiments . . . . . 87
  
- 7.1  $\succeq$ -maximal subsets for employee availability . . . . . 105
- 7.2 Result for programs without propagation . . . . . 107
- 7.3 Programs for programs with propagation . . . . . 107



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

In this Chapter, we summarize the works on termination and non-termination analysis in Logic Programs and explain how they motivate our research. In Section 1.2, we give an overview of the thesis.

### 1.1 The Termination Problem in Logic Programming

One of the central concerns of declarative programming, in particular of Logic Programming, is that the use of a declarative programming style in a declarative programming language leads to less error-prone, more understandable and better maintainable programs. However, it is well-known that a declarative programming style also results in less efficient computations, and in the extreme case, in non-terminating computations. The latter problem has received considerable attention within the community. Much research has been done on termination analysis, loop detection and more recently, non-termination analysis.

Among these areas, termination analysis has by far received most attention. [16] presents a survey of the extensive amount of work up till 1994. However, most of the more powerful approaches and techniques have been introduced in the last decade: the constrained-based approach to termination analysis [18], the local approaches [15], the use of types in termination analysis [10], powerful transformational approaches [46], termination inference [33], and the porting of TRS-techniques to the LP-context [35].

A rather recent concern in this research is the precision of the termination analysis. Since termination is undecidable in general, only sufficient conditions for termination are verified. It is important to have a good understanding of the precision of these techniques: do they actually capture most of the terminating computations?

With respect to the other two approaches, loop detection and non-termination analysis, there is often confusion concerning their relation. Because both approaches use similar techniques, their distinguishing features and aims are not always well understood. Loop detection is a run-time technique. It aims to cut infinite derivations for a concrete query at run-time. One of the possible approaches to achieve this is tabulation [43]. For an extensive overview and comparison of different loop checking algorithms, we refer to [7]. Non-termination analysis is a compile-time approach. It aims to prove that a certain class of queries will result in non-terminating computations for at least some of the queries in the considered class. Non-termination analysis is performed for classes of queries described in terms of modes (or types). One of the key concerns of non-termination analysis is to address the important issue of precision analysis of termination analysis. A termination analysis can be shown to be precise by proving that the class of queries for which termination could not be proven is actually non-terminating. This has been one of the main goals and achievements of the first non-termination analyzer for Logic Programs, *NTI*[38].

Due to the nature of undecidability, there must be situations in which neither a termination proof nor a non-termination proof can apply; i.e., no sufficient termination/non-termination conditions are satisfied so that the user would get no conclusion (see the results of the Termination Competition 2007 [1]). We observe that in such a situation, it is particularly useful to compute an approximate conclusion indicating possible termination or possible non-termination, which guides the user to continue to improve his program towards termination. To the best of our knowledge, however, no existing approximation approach was available before our work.

## 1.2 Overview and goals of the Thesis

Chapter 2 introduces the basic notions of Logic Programming and loop checking, which are essential for understanding the thesis.

Chapter 3 proposes an approximation approach to termination analysis, called *termination prediction*. In the case that neither a termination nor a non-termination proof is applicable, we appeal to an approximation algorithm to

predict possible termination or non-termination. We develop a framework for predicting termination of general logic programs with concrete queries or *moded* queries. Moded queries allow to represent arbitrary ground terms by input modes. For example  $flat(\mathcal{I}, O)$ , with  $\mathcal{I}$  an input mode, represents all *flat* queries with a ground term as a first argument and a free variable as second argument. The basic idea of our analysis is that we establish a characterization of infinite (generalized) SLDNF-derivations with arbitrary queries. Then based on the characterization, we design a complete loop checking mechanism, which cuts all infinite SLDNF-derivations. Given a logic program and a query, we evaluate the query by applying SLDNF-resolution while performing loop checking. If the query evaluation proceeds without encountering potential infinite derivations, we predict *terminating* for this query; otherwise we predict *non-terminating*. It is nontrivial to characterize infinite SLDNF-derivations with moded queries. The first challenge we must address is how to formulate an SLDNF-derivation for a moded query  $Q_0$ , as the standard SLDNF-resolution is only for concrete queries [14, 28]. We will introduce a framework called a *moded-query forest*, which consists of all (generalized) SLDNF-trees rooted at an instance of  $Q_0$  (the instance is  $Q_0$  with each input mode replaced by a ground term). An SLDNF-derivation for  $Q_0$  is then defined over the moded-query forest such that a logic program  $P$  terminates for  $Q_0$  if and only if the moded-query forest contains no infinite SLDNF-derivations. A moded-query forest may have an infinite number of SLDNF-trees, so it is infeasible for us to predict termination of a logic program by traversing the moded-query forest. To handle this challenge, we will introduce a novel compact approximation for a moded-query forest, called a *moded generalized SLDNF-tree*. The key idea is to treat an input mode as a special meta-variable in the way that during query evaluation, it can be substituted by a constant or function, but cannot be substituted by an ordinary variable. As a result, SLDNF-derivations for a moded query can be constructed in the same way as the ones for a concrete query. A characterization of infinite SLDNF-derivations for moded queries is then established in terms of some key properties of a moded generalized SLDNF-tree. We have implemented a termination prediction system and obtained quite satisfactory experimental results. Our prediction is 100% correct for all benchmark programs of the Termination Competition 2007, of which eighteen programs cannot be proved by the existing state-of-the-art analyzers like *AProVE07*, *NTI*, *Polytool* and *TALP*.

Chapter 4 introduces a new non-termination analysis. It reuses the analysis scheme proposed in Chapter 3 to produce a finite representation of the computation for a moded query, given some logic program. We introduce a new non-termination condition expressed in terms of this finite representation of the computation.

**Example 1.1.**

```

flat(niltree, nil).
flat(tree(X, niltree, XS), cons(X, YS)) :- flat(XS, YS).
flat(tree(X, tree(Y, YS1, YS2), XS), ZS) :-
    flat(tree(Y, YS1, tree(X, YS2, XS)), ZS).

```

*This program, `flat`, flattens a binary tree into a list denoted with the `cons` notation. To flatten the tree, the program repeatedly moves one element from the left to the right subtree until the left subtree is empty. When the left subtree is empty, we proceed by processing the right subtree. If the first argument of the query is a variable, this program loops w.r.t. the third clause.  $\square$*

This non-termination condition detects that a sequence of derivation steps can be repeated infinitely for a class of queries. For the *flat* program in Example 1.1, it will prove that the last clause can be repeated infinitely for queries with a variable as a first argument. We prove the correctness of the condition and extend it to increase its applicability. It turns out that our characterization of non-terminating computations is more precise than that of *NTI*. We have implemented the technique in the analyzer *P2P* and performed extensive experiments with it on the basis of the benchmark of the termination analysis competition of 2007<sup>1</sup>. The experiments show that our technique has a 100% success-rate on this benchmark, outperforming the only competing approach, *NTI*.

Although we experienced this as a success, the experiment mostly shows that the benchmark does not offer sufficient challenges for non-termination analysis. Chapter 5 focuses on two new directions. One is to identify classes of programs for which non-termination analyzers developed before 2011 fail. A second is to investigate whether the inclusion of type-information, in addition to modes, may improve the power of our analyzer. Considering the first of these questions, a limitation of both *NTI* and *P2P* is that they only detect non-terminating derivations if, within these derivations, some fixed sequence of clauses can be applied repeatedly. Example 1.2 shows a program that violates this restriction.

**Example 1.2.** *The program, `longer`, loops for any query `longer(L)`, with `L` a non-empty list of zeros. The predicate `zeros/1` checks if the list contains only zeros. At the recursive call, a zero is added to the list.*

---

<sup>1</sup><http://www.lri.fr/~marche/termination-competition/>

```

longer([0|L]):-
    zeros(L),
    longer([0,0|L]).
zeros([]).
zeros([0|L]):- zeros(L).

```

*The list in the recursive call is longer than the original one and thus, the number of applications of the recursive clause for zeros/1 increases in each recursion. Therefore, no fixed sequence of clauses can be repeated infinitely and previous non-termination analyzers fail to prove non-termination of this example.  $\square$*

In Chapter 5, we overcome this limitation by using non-failure information. *Non-failure analysis* [17] detects classes of goals that can be guaranteed not to fail, given mode and type information. Its applications include inferring minimal computational costs, guiding transformations and debugging. To use the information provided by non-failure analysis in the non-termination analysis of [58], type information must be added to the symbolic derivation tree. We add this information using regular types [60]. Extending our non-termination analysis with non-failure information allows to prove non-termination for programs such as the one in Example 1.2. Another limitation of previous non-termination analyzers is related to aliased variables. Non-termination analyzers developed before 2011 fail to prove non-termination of programs such as the one in Example 1.3.

### **Example 1.3.**

```

append([],L,L).
append([H|T],L,[H|R]):- append(T,L,R).

```

*The query `append(X,X,X)` succeeds once with a computed answer substitution  $X/[]$ . The program loops after backtracking.  $\square$*

Program specialization [26] allows to transform this program and query into an equivalent program and query for which non-termination can be proven. In Chapter 5, we extend the technique of Chapter 4 with type information. Then, we use non-failure analysis and specialization to deal with the classes of programs illustrated by the examples above. In addition to these two classes of programs, there are combinations of them that yield a fairly large class of new programs that we can prove non-terminating using non-failure analysis combined with program specialization.

Both termination and non-termination analyzers have been rather successful in analyzing the termination behavior of definite logic programs, but their

applicability on real-life Prolog programs is limited because most Prolog programs use non-logical features. Chapter 6 takes a first step towards the analysis of real-life Prolog programs, by presenting a non-termination condition for Logic Programs containing integer arithmetics. Given a program, containing integer arithmetics, and a class of queries, we infer a subset of these queries for which we prove existential non-termination. The inference and proof are done in two phases. In the first phase, non-termination of the logic part of the program is proven by assuming that all comparisons between integer expressions succeed. In the second phase, given the moded query, integer arguments are identified and constraints over these arguments are formulated, such that solutions for these constraints correspond to non-terminating queries. We will illustrate this with an example.

**Example 1.4.** *The following program, `count_to`, is a faulty implementation of a predicate generating the list starting from 0 up to a given number. The considered class of queries is represented by the moded query  $\leftarrow \text{count\_to}(\underline{N}, L)$  with  $\underline{N}$  an integer variable and  $L$  a free variable.*

```
count_to(N,L):- count(0,N,L).
count(N,N,[N]).
count(M,N,[M|L]):- M > N, M1 is M+1, count(M1,N,L).
```

*In the last clause, the integer condition should be  $M < N$  instead of  $M > N$ . Due to this error, the program:*

- *fails for the queries for which  $\underline{N} > 0$  holds,*
- *succeeds for  $\leftarrow \text{count\_to}(0, L)$ ,*
- *loops for the queries for which  $\underline{N} < 0$  holds.*

*The first phase of the analysis detects non-termination assuming the arithmetic predicates succeed. For the considered class of queries `count` is always called with a free variable as the third argument. Therefore, any considered query loops w.r.t. the last clause if the arithmetic calls succeed.*

*The second phase of the analysis completes the non-termination proof by inferring the constraint  $\underline{N} < 0$  on the considered class of queries.* □

Chapter 7 discusses the less related topic of Termination analysis of Constraint Handling Rules (CHR). CHR was designed to develop custom constraint solvers but proved successful as a general purpose programming language. The language rewrites multisets of constraints, the constraint store, and defines two types of



rules. Simplification rules replace constraints by equivalent, simpler constraints. Propagation rules add extra constraints to the store. Because propagation rules do not remove constraints, a propagation history is used to prevent a combination of constraints of firing a propagation rule more than once. Chapter 7 presents the first termination condition for CHR with propagation rules.

Finally, Chapter 8 concludes the thesis.



# Chapter 2

## Preliminaries

In this chapter, we present the basic concepts and definitions of logic programming and loop checking that are necessary for understanding the thesis. Definitions and concepts that are specific to a chapter will be introduced in that chapter.

### 2.1 Logic Programming

Logic programming (LP) is a programming paradigm based on *first order logic* [28]. In our research, we focus on general logic programming as implemented by Prolog. A logic program consists of an alphabet, a first order language, a set of axioms and a set of inference rules. The alphabet includes sets of *variables*, *constants*, *function symbols*, *predicate symbols* and *connectives*. To denote variables, we use uppercase characters, e.g.,  $X$ ,  $Y$ ,  $Z$ . Usually, function symbols are denoted  $f$ ,  $g$ ,  $h$ , and predicate symbols are denoted  $p$ ,  $q$ ,  $r$ . Each function or predicate symbol  $f$  is associated with a natural number  $n$ , the arity of  $f$ . We often write  $f/n$  to denote that a function or a predicate symbol  $f$  (a functor) has arity  $n$ . Constant symbols are function symbols with arity 0, denoted by lowercase letters, e.g.,  $a$ ,  $b$ ,  $c$ . Connectives are  $\leftarrow$  (implication) and  $\wedge$  (conjunction).

*Terms* and *atoms*, two basic components of logic programming, are defined based on variables, constants, function and predicate symbols. A term is either a variable, a constant, or  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  if  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  are terms and  $f/n$  is a function symbol. For simplicity, we use  $\bar{T}$  to denote a set of terms  $T_1, \dots, T_m$ . Lists are

commonly used terms. A list is of the form  $[]$  or  $[T|L]$  where  $T$  is a term and  $L$  is a list. For our purpose, the symbols  $[, ]$  and  $|$  in a list are treated as special constant symbols. Similarly,  $p(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  is an atom if  $p/n$  is a predicate symbol and  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  are terms. Let  $A$  be an atom/term. The size of  $A$ , denoted  $|A|$ , is the number of occurrences of function symbols, variables and constants in  $A$ . Two atoms are called *variants* if they are the same up to variable renaming. A literal is an atom  $A$  or the negation  $\neg A$  of  $A$ . A term or an atom, that is variable free, is called *ground*. Otherwise, it is called *non-ground*. For a term or atom  $t$ , we use the notation  $Var(t)$  to denote the set of all variables occurring in  $t$ .

A *definite logic program*  $P$  is a finite set of clauses of the form  $A \leftarrow A_1, \dots, A_n$ , where  $A$  and each  $A_i$  is an atom. A *general logic program*  $P$  is a finite set of clauses of the form  $A \leftarrow L_1, \dots, L_n$ , where  $A$  is an atom and each  $L_i$  is a literal. Throughout the thesis, we consider only Herbrand models [28]. The Herbrand universe and Herbrand base of  $P$  are denoted by  $HU(P)$  and  $HB(P)$ , respectively.

A *goal*  $G_i$  is a headless clause  $\leftarrow L_1, \dots, L_n$  where each literal  $L_j$  is called a *subgoal*. The goal,  $G_0 = \leftarrow Q_0$ , for a query  $Q_0$  is called a *top goal*. Without loss of generality, we assume that  $Q_0$  consists only of one atom.  $Q_0$  is a *moded query* if some arguments of  $Q_0$  are input modes (in this case,  $Q_0$  is called an *abstract atom* or a *moded atom*); otherwise, it is a *concrete query*. An input mode always begins with a letter  $\mathcal{I}$  and corresponds to a ground term. For more information about mode analysis in logic programming, we refer to [29].

Let  $P$  be a logic program and  $G_0$  a top goal.  $G_0$  is evaluated by building a *generalized SLDNF-tree*  $GT_{G_0}$  as defined in [51], in which each node is represented by  $N_i : G_i$  where  $N_i$  is the name of the node and  $G_i$  is a goal attached to the node. We do not reproduce the definition of a generalized SLDNF-tree. Roughly speaking,  $GT_{G_0}$  is the set of standard SLDNF-trees for  $P \cup \{G_0\}$  augmented with an ancestor-descendant relation on their subgoals. Let  $L_i$  and  $L_j$  be the selected subgoals at two nodes  $N_i$  and  $N_j$ , respectively.  $L_i$  is an *ancestor* of  $L_j$ , denoted  $L_i \prec_{anc} L_j$ , if  $L_j$  is selected as a subgoal in the proof of  $L_i$ . Throughout the thesis, we choose to use the best-known *depth-first, left-most* control strategy, as is used in Prolog, to select nodes/goals and subgoals (it can be adapted to any other fixed control strategies). So by the *selected subgoal* in each node  $N_i : \leftarrow L_1, \dots, L_n$ , we refer to the left-most subgoal  $L_1$ .

Recall that in SLDNF-resolution, let  $L_i = \neg A$  be a ground negative subgoal selected at  $N_i$ , then (by the negation-as-failure rule [14]) a subsidiary child SLDNF-tree  $T_{N_{i+1} : \leftarrow A}$  rooted at  $N_{i+1} : \leftarrow A$  will be built to solve  $A$ . In a generalized SLDNF-tree  $GT_{G_0}$ , such parent and child SLDNF-trees are

connected from  $N_i$  to  $N_{i+1}$  via a dotted edge " $\cdots \triangleright$ " (called a *negation arc*), and  $A$  at  $N_{i+1}$  inherits all ancestors of  $L_i$  at  $N_i$ . Therefore, a path of a generalized SLDNF-tree may come across several SLDNF-trees through dotted edges. Any such a path starting at the root node  $N_0 : G_0$  of  $GT_{G_0}$  is called a *generalized SLDNF-derivation*.

We do not consider *floundering* queries; i.e., we assume that no non-ground negative subgoals are selected at any node of a generalized SLDNF-tree (see [51]).

Another feature of a generalized SLDNF-tree  $GT_{G_0}$  is that each subsidiary child SLDNF-tree  $T_{N_{i+1}:\leftarrow A}$  in  $GT_{G_0}$  terminates (i.e. stops expanding its nodes) at the first success leaf. The intuition behind this is that it is absolutely unnecessary to exhaust the remaining branches because they would never generate any new answers for  $A$  (since  $A$  is ground). In fact, Prolog executes the same pruning by using a *cut* operator to skip the remaining branches once the first success leaf is generated (e.g. see SICStus Prolog [25]). To illustrate, consider the following logic program and top goal:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
 P_0 : & p \leftarrow \neg q. & C_{p_1} \\
 & q. & C_{q_1} \\
 & q \leftarrow q. & C_{q_2} \\
 G_0 : & \leftarrow p. & 
 \end{array}$$

The generalized SLDNF-tree  $GT_{G_0}$  for  $P_0 \cup \{G_0\}$  is depicted in Figure 2.1. Note that the subsidiary child SLDNF-tree  $T_{N_2:\leftarrow q}$  terminates at the first success leaf  $N_3$ , leaving  $N_4$  not further expanded. As a result, all generalized SLDNF-derivations in  $GT_{G_0}$  are finite.




Figure 2.1: The generalized SLDNF-tree  $GT_{G_0}$  of  $P_0$ .

For simplicity, in the following sections by a derivation or SLDNF-derivation we refer to a generalized SLDNF-derivation. Moreover, for any node  $N_i : G_i$  we use  $L_i^1$  to refer to the selected subgoal in  $G_i$ .

A derivation step is denoted by  $N_i : G_i \Rightarrow_{C, \theta_i} N_{i+1} : G_{i+1}$ , meaning that applying a clause  $C$  to  $G_i$  produces  $N_{i+1} : G_{i+1}$ , where  $G_{i+1}$  is the resolvent of  $C$  and  $G_i$  on  $L_i^1$  with the mgu (most general unifier)  $\theta_i$ . Here, for a substitution of two variables,  $X$  in  $L_i^1$  and  $Y$  in (the head of)  $C$ , we always use  $X$  to substitute for  $Y$ . When no confusion would occur, we may omit the mgu  $\theta_i$  when writing a derivation step.

### 2.1.1 Loop Checking

Loop checking is a runtime approach to prevent non-termination during query evaluation. Non-termination is prevented by modifying the computation mechanism that searches through an SLDNF-tree by adding the possibility of pruning.

A loop checking mechanism, or more formally a *loop check* [8], defines conditions for us to cut a possibly infinite derivation at some node. By cutting a derivation at a node  $N$  we mean removing all descendants of  $N$ . Informally, a loop check is said to be *weakly sound* if for any generalized SLDNF-tree  $GT_{G_0}$ ,  $GT_{G_0}$  having a success derivation before cut implies it has a success derivation after cut; it is said to be *complete* if it cuts all infinite derivations in  $GT_{G_0}$ . An ideal loop check cuts all infinite derivations while retaining success derivations. Unfortunately, as shown by Bol et al. [8], there exists no loop check that is both weakly sound and complete. In the thesis, we focus on complete loop checks, because we want to apply them to analyze the termination behavior of logic programs.

**Definition 2.1.** A loop check  $L$  is **complete** w.r.t. SLDNF-resolution if for every logic program  $P$  and query  $Q$ , every infinite derivation of  $P$  for  $Q$  is cut by  $L$ .  $\square$

## Chapter 3

# Termination Prediction for General Logic Programs

This chapter proposes the idea of *termination prediction*, as depicted in Figure 3.1. In the case that neither a termination nor a non-termination proof is applicable, we appeal to an approximation algorithm to predict possible termination or non-termination. The prediction applies to general logic programs with concrete or moded queries.

We develop a framework for predicting termination of general logic programs with arbitrary (i.e., concrete or moded) queries. The basic idea is that we establish a characterization of infinite (generalized) SLDNF-derivations with arbitrary queries. Then based on the characterization, we design a complete loop checking mechanism, which cuts all infinite SLDNF-derivations. Given a logic program and a query, we evaluate the query by applying SLDNF-resolution while performing loop checking. If the query evaluation proceeds without encountering potential infinite derivations, we predict *terminating* for this query; otherwise we predict *non-terminating*.

The core of our termination prediction is a characterization of infinite SLDNF-derivations with arbitrary queries. In [51], a characterization is established for general logic programs with concrete queries. This is far from enough for termination prediction; a characterization of infinite SLDNF-derivations for moded queries is required. Moded queries are the most commonly used query form in static termination analysis. A moded query contains (abstract) atoms like  $p(\mathcal{I}, T)$  where  $T$  is a term and  $\mathcal{I}$  is an input mode. An *input mode* stands for an arbitrary ground term, so that to prove that a logic program terminates




Figure 3.1: A framework for handling the termination problem

for a moded query  $p(\mathcal{I}, T)$  is to prove that the program terminates for any (concrete) query  $p(t, T)$  where  $t$  is a ground term.

It is nontrivial to characterize infinite SLDNF-derivations with moded queries. The first challenge we must address is how to formulate an SLDNF-derivation for a moded query  $Q_0$ , as the standard SLDNF-resolution is only for concrete queries [14, 28]. We will introduce a framework called a *moded-query forest*, which consists of all (generalized) SLDNF-trees rooted at an instance of  $Q_0$  (the instance is  $Q_0$  with each input mode replaced by a ground term). An SLDNF-derivation for  $Q_0$  is then defined over the moded-query forest such that a logic program  $P$  terminates for  $Q_0$  if and only if the moded-query forest contains no infinite SLDNF-derivations.

A moded-query forest may have an infinite number of SLDNF-trees, so it is infeasible for us to predict termination of a logic program by traversing the



moded-query forest. To handle this challenge, we will introduce a novel compact approximation for a moded-query forest, called a *moded generalized SLDNF-tree*. The key idea is to treat an input mode as a special meta-variable in the way that during query evaluation, it can be substituted by a constant or function, but cannot be substituted by an ordinary variable. As a result, SLDNF-derivations for a moded query can be constructed in the same way as the ones for a concrete query. A characterization of infinite SLDNF-derivations for moded queries is then established in terms of some key properties of a moded generalized SLDNF-tree.

We have implemented a termination prediction system and obtained quite satisfactory experimental results. Our prediction is 100% correct for all benchmark programs of the Termination Competition 2007, of which eighteen programs cannot be proved by the existing state-of-the-art analyzers like AProVE07, NTI, Polytool and TALP.

### 3.1 A Characterization of Infinite SLDNF-Derivations for Concrete Queries

In this section, we review the characterization of infinite derivations with concrete queries presented in [51].

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $T$  be a term or an atom and  $S$  be a string that consists of all predicate symbols, function symbols, constants and variables in  $T$ , which is obtained by reading these symbols sequentially from left to right. The *symbol string* of  $T$ , denoted  $S_T$ , is the string  $S$  with every variable replaced by  $\mathcal{X}$ .  $\square$

For instance, let  $T_1 = a$  and  $T_2 = f(X, g(X, f(a, Y)))$ . Then  $S_{T_1} = a$  and  $S_{T_2} = f\mathcal{X}g\mathcal{X}fa\mathcal{X}$ .

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $S_{T_1}$  and  $S_{T_2}$  be two symbol strings.  $S_{T_1}$  is a *projection* of  $S_{T_2}$ , denoted  $S_{T_1} \subseteq_{proj} S_{T_2}$ , if  $S_{T_1}$  is obtained from  $S_{T_2}$  by removing zero or more elements.  $\square$

**Definition 3.3.** Let  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  be two atoms (positive subgoals) with the same predicate symbol.  $A_1$  is said to *loop into*  $A_2$ , denoted  $A_1 \rightsquigarrow_{loop} A_2$ , if  $S_{A_1} \subseteq_{proj} S_{A_2}$ . Let  $N_i : G_i$  and  $N_j : G_j$  be two nodes in a derivation with  $L_i^1 \prec_{anc} L_j^1$  and  $L_i^1 \rightsquigarrow_{loop} L_j^1$ . Then  $G_j$  is called a *loop goal* of  $G_i$ .  $\square$

Observe that if  $A_1 \rightsquigarrow_{loop} A_2$  then  $|A_1| \leq |A_2|$ , and that if  $G_3$  is a loop goal of  $G_2$  that is a loop goal of  $G_1$  then  $G_3$  is a loop goal of  $G_1$ . Since a logic program has only a finite number of clauses, an infinite derivation results from repeatedly

applying the same set of clauses, which leads to either infinite repetition of selected variant subgoals or infinite repetition of selected subgoals with recursive increase in term size. By recursive increase of term size of a subgoal  $A$  from a subgoal  $B$  we mean that  $A$  is  $B$  with a few function/constant/variable symbols added and possibly with some variables changed to different variables. Such crucial dynamic characteristics of an infinite derivation are captured by loop goals. The following result is proved in [51].

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $G_0 = \leftarrow Q_0$  be a top goal with  $Q_0$  a concrete query. Any infinite derivation  $D$  in  $GT_{G_0}$  contains an infinite sequence of goals  $G_0, \dots, G_{g_1}, \dots, G_{g_2}, \dots$  such that for any  $j \geq 1$ ,  $G_{g_{j+1}}$  is a loop goal of  $G_{g_j}$ .  $\square$*

Put another way, Theorem 3.1 states that any infinite derivation  $D$  in  $GT_{G_0}$  is of the form

$$N_0 : G_0 \Rightarrow_{C_0} \dots N_{g_1} : G_{g_1} \Rightarrow_{C_1} \dots N_{g_2} : G_{g_2} \Rightarrow_{C_2} \dots N_{g_3} : G_{g_3} \Rightarrow_{C_3} \dots$$

where for any  $j \geq 1$ ,  $G_{g_{j+1}}$  is a loop goal of  $G_{g_j}$ . This provides a necessary and sufficient characterization of an infinite generalized SLDNF-derivation with a concrete query.

**Example 3.1.** Consider the following logic program:

$$\begin{array}{ll} P_1 : & p(a). \\ & p(f(X)) \leftarrow p(X). \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l} C_{p_1} \\ C_{p_2} \end{array}$$

The generalized SLDNF-tree  $GT_{\leftarrow p(X)}$  for a concrete query  $p(X)$  is shown in Figure 3.2, where for simplicity the symbol  $\leftarrow$  in each goal is omitted. Note that  $GT_{\leftarrow p(X)}$  has an infinite derivation

$$N_0 : p(X) \Rightarrow_{C_{p_2}} N_2 : p(X_2) \Rightarrow_{C_{p_2}} N_4 : p(X_4) \Rightarrow_{C_{p_2}} \dots$$

where for any  $j \geq 0$ ,  $G_{2(j+1)}$  is a loop goal of  $G_{2j}$ .  $\square$

## 3.2 A Characterization of Infinite SLDNF-Derivations for Moded Queries

We first define generalized SLDNF-derivations for moded queries by introducing a framework called moded-query forests.




Figure 3.2: The generalized SLDNF-tree  $GT_{\leftarrow p(X)}$  of  $P_1$  for a concrete query  $p(X)$ .

**Definition 3.4.** Let  $P$  be a logic program and  $Q_0 = p(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_m, T_1, \dots, T_n)$  a moded query. The *moded-query forest* of  $P$  for  $Q_0$ , denoted  $MF_{Q_0}$ , consists of all generalized SLDNF-trees for  $P \cup \{G_0\}$ , where  $G_0 = \leftarrow p(t_1, \dots, t_m, T_1, \dots, T_n)$  with each  $t_i$  being a ground term from  $HU(P)$ . A (*generalized SLDNF*-) *derivation for the moded query*  $Q_0$  is a derivation in any generalized SLDNF-tree of  $MF_{Q_0}$ .  $\square$

Therefore, a logic program  $P$  terminates for a moded query  $Q_0$  if and only if there is no infinite derivation for  $Q_0$  if and only if  $MF_{Q_0}$  has no infinite derivation.

**Example 3.2.** Consider the logic program  $P_1$  again. We have  $HU(P_1) = \{a, f(a), f(f(a)), \dots\}$ . Let  $p(\mathcal{I})$  be a moded query. The moded-query forest  $MF_{p(\mathcal{I})}$  consists of generalized SLDNF-trees  $GT_{\leftarrow p(a)}$ ,  $GT_{\leftarrow p(f(a))}$ , etc., as shown in Figure 3.3. Note that  $MF_{p(\mathcal{I})}$  has an infinite number of generalized SLDNF-trees. However, any individual tree,  $GT_{G_0}$  with  $G_0 = \leftarrow p(\underbrace{f(f(\dots f(a)\dots))}_{n \text{ items}})$  ( $n \geq 0$ ), is finite.  $MF_{p(\mathcal{I})}$  contains no infinite derivation, thus  $P_1$  terminates for  $p(\mathcal{I})$ .  $\square$




Figure 3.3: The moded-query forest  $MF_{p(\mathcal{I})}$  of  $P_1$  for a moded query  $p(\mathcal{I})$ .

In a moded-query forest, all input modes are instantiated into ground terms in  $HU(P)$ . When  $HU(P)$  is infinite, the moded-query forest would contain infinitely many generalized SLDNF-trees. This means that it is infeasible to build a moded-query forest to represent the derivations for a moded query. An alternative yet ideal way is to directly apply SLDNF-resolution to evaluate input modes and build a compact generalized SLDNF-tree for a moded query. Unfortunately, SLDNF-resolution accepts only terms as arguments of a top goal; an input mode  $\mathcal{I}$  is not directly evaluable.

Since an input mode stands for an arbitrary ground term, i.e. it can be any term from  $HU(P)$ , during query evaluation it can be instantiated to any term except variable (note that a ground term cannot be substituted by a variable). This suggests that we may approximate the effect of an input mode  $\mathcal{I}$  by treating it as a special (meta-) variable  $I$  in the way that in SLDNF-derivations,  $I$  can be substituted by a constant or function, but cannot be substituted by an ordinary variable. Therefore, when doing unification of a special variable  $I$  and a variable  $X$ , we always substitute  $I$  for  $X$ .

**Definition 3.5.** Let  $P$  be a logic program and  $Q_0 = p(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_m, T_1, \dots, T_n)$  a moded query. The *moded generalized SLDNF-tree* of  $P$  for  $Q_0$ , denoted  $MT_{Q_0}$ , is defined to be the generalized SLDNF-tree  $GT_{G_0}$  for  $P \cup \{G_0\}$ , where  $G_0 = \leftarrow p(I_1, \dots, I_m, T_1, \dots, T_n)$  with each  $I_i$  being a distinct special variable not occurring in any  $T_j$ . The special variables  $I_1, \dots, I_m$  for the input modes  $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_m$  are called *input mode variables* (or *input variables*).  $\square$

In a moded generalized SLDNF-tree, an input variable  $I$  may be substituted by either a constant  $t$  or a function  $f(\bar{T})$ . It will not be substituted by any non-input variable. If  $I$  is substituted by  $f(\bar{T})$ , all variables in  $\bar{T}$  are also called input variables (thus are treated as special variables).

In the thesis, we do not consider *floundering moded queries*; i.e., we assume that no negative subgoals containing either ordinary or input variables are selected at any node of a moded generalized SLDNF-tree.

**Definition 3.6.** Let  $P$  be a logic program,  $Q_0 = p(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_m, T_1, \dots, T_n)$  a moded query, and  $G_0 = \leftarrow p(I_1, \dots, I_m, T_1, \dots, T_n)$ . Let  $D$  be a derivation in the moded generalized SLDNF-tree  $MT_{Q_0}$ . A *moded instance* of  $D$  is a derivation obtained from  $D$  by first instantiating all input variables at the root node  $N_0 : G_0$  with an mgu  $\theta = \{I_1/t_1, \dots, I_m/t_m\}$ , where each  $t_i \in HU(P)$ , then passing the instantiation  $\theta$  down to the other nodes of  $D$ .  $\square$

**Example 3.3.** Consider the logic program  $P_1$  again. Let  $Q_0 = p(\mathcal{I})$  be a moded query and  $G_0 = \leftarrow p(I)$ . The moded generalized SLDNF-tree  $MT_{Q_0}$  is  $GT_{G_0}$  as depicted in Figure 3.4, where all input variables are underlined. Since

$I$  is an input variable,  $X_2$  is an input variable, too (due to the mgu  $\theta_2$ ). For the same reason, all  $X_{2i}$  are input variables ( $i > 0$ ).

Consider the following infinite derivation  $D$  in  $MT_{Q_0}$ :

$$N_0 : p(I) \Rightarrow_{C_{p_2}} N_2 : p(X_2) \Rightarrow_{C_{p_2}} N_4 : p(X_4) \Rightarrow_{C_{p_2}} \dots$$

By instantiating the input variable  $I$  at  $N_0$  with different ground terms from  $HU(P_1)$  and passing the instantiation  $\theta$  down to the other nodes of  $D$ , we can obtain different moded instances from  $D$ . For example, instantiating  $I$  to  $a$  (i.e.  $\theta = \{I/a\}$ ) yields the moded instance

$$N_0 : p(a)$$

Instantiating  $I$  to  $f(a)$  (i.e.  $\theta = \{I/f(a)\}$ ) yields the moded instance

$$N_0 : p(f(a)) \Rightarrow_{C_{p_2}} N_2 : p(a)$$

And, instantiating  $I$  to  $f(f(a))$  (i.e.  $\theta = \{I/f(f(a))\}$ ) yields the moded instance

$$N_0 : p(f(f(a))) \Rightarrow_{C_{p_2}} N_2 : p(f(a)) \Rightarrow_{C_{p_2}} N_4 : p(a)$$

□




Figure 3.4: The moded generalized SLDNF-tree  $MT_{p(I)}$  of  $P_1$  for a moded query  $p(I)$ .

Observe that a moded instance of a derivation  $D$  in  $MT_{Q_0}$  is a derivation in  $GT_{G_0\theta}$ , where  $G_0\theta = \leftarrow p(t_1, \dots, t_m, T_1, \dots, T_n)$  with each  $t_i$  being a ground term from  $HU(P)$ . By Definition 3.4,  $GT_{G_0\theta}$  is in the moded-query forest  $MF_{Q_0}$ . This means that any moded instance of a derivation in  $MT_{Q_0}$  is a derivation for  $Q_0$  in  $MF_{Q_0}$ . For instance, all moded instances illustrated in Example 3.3 are derivations in the moded-query forest  $MF_{Q_0}$  of Figure 3.3.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $MF_{Q_0}$  and  $MT_{Q_0}$  be the moded-query forest and the moded generalized SLDNF-tree of  $P$  for  $Q_0$ , respectively. If  $MF_{Q_0}$  has an infinite derivation  $D'$ ,  $MT_{Q_0}$  has an infinite derivation  $D$  with  $D'$  as a moded instance.*  
□

*Proof.* Let  $Q_0 = p(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_m, T_1, \dots, T_n)$ . Then, the root node of  $D'$  is  $N_0 \leftarrow p(t_1, \dots, t_m, T_1, \dots, T_n)$  with each  $t_i \in HU(P)$ , and the root node of  $MT_{Q_0}$  is  $N_0 \leftarrow p(I_1, \dots, I_m, T_1, \dots, T_n)$  with each  $I_i$  being an input variable not occurring in any  $T_j$ . Note that the former is an instance of the latter with the mgu  $\theta = \{I_1/t_1, \dots, I_m/t_m\}$ . Let  $D'$  be of the form

$$N_0 \leftarrow p(t_1, \dots, t_m, T_1, \dots, T_n) \Rightarrow_{C_0} N_1 : G'_1 \cdots \Rightarrow_{C_i} N_{i+1} : G'_{i+1} \cdots$$

$MT_{Q_0}$  must have a derivation  $D$  of the form

$$N_0 \leftarrow p(I_1, \dots, I_m, T_1, \dots, T_n) \Rightarrow_{C_0} N_1 : G_1 \cdots \Rightarrow_{C_i} N_{i+1} : G_{i+1} \cdots$$

such that each  $G'_i = G_i\theta$ , since for any  $i \geq 0$  and any clause  $C_i$  in  $P$ , if  $G'_i$  can unify with  $C_i$ , so can  $G_i$  with  $C_i$ . Note that when the selected subgoal at some  $G'_i$  is a negative ground literal, by the assumption that  $Q_0$  is non-floundering, we have the same selected literal at  $G_i$ . We then have the proof. □

Our goal is to establish a characterization of infinite derivations for a moded query such that the converse of Theorem 3.2 is true under some conditions.

Consider the infinite derivation in Figure 3.4 again. The input variable  $I$  is substituted by  $f(X_2)$ ;  $X_2$  is then substituted by  $f(X_4)$ , ... This produces an infinite chain of substitutions for  $I$  of the form  $I/f(X_2), X_2/f(X_4), \dots$ . The following lemma shows that infinite derivations containing such an infinite chain of substitutions have no infinite moded instances.

**Lemma 3.1.** *If a derivation  $D$  in a moded generalized SLDNF-tree  $MT_{Q_0}$  is infinite but none of its moded instances is infinite, then there is an input variable  $I$  such that  $D$  contains an infinite chain of substitutions for  $I$  of the form*

$$I/f_1(\dots, Y_1, \dots), \dots, Y_1/f_2(\dots, Y_2, \dots), \dots, Y_{i-1}/f_i(\dots, Y_i, \dots), \dots \quad (3.1)$$

(some  $f_i$ s would be the same). □

*Proof.* We distinguish four types of substitution chains for an input variable  $I$  in  $D$ :

1.  $X_1/I, \dots, X_m/I$  or  $X_1/I, \dots, X_i/I, \dots$ . That is,  $I$  is never substituted by any terms.
2.  $X_1/I, \dots, X_m/I, I/t$  where  $t$  is a ground term. That is,  $I$  is substituted by a ground term.
3.  $X_1/I, \dots, X_m/I, I/f_1(\dots, Y_1, \dots), \dots, Y_1/f_2(\dots, Y_2, \dots), \dots, Y_{n-1}/f_n(\dots, Y_n, \dots), \dots$ , where  $f_n(\dots, Y_n, \dots)$  is the last non-ground function in the substitution chain for  $I$  in  $D$ . In this case,  $I$  is recursively substituted by a finite number of functions.
4.  $X_1/I, \dots, X_m/I, I/f_1(\dots, Y_1, \dots), \dots, Y_1/f_2(\dots, Y_2, \dots), \dots, Y_{i-1}/f_i(\dots, Y_i, \dots), \dots$ . In this case,  $I$  is recursively substituted by an infinite number of functions.

For type 1,  $D$  retains its infinite extension for whatever ground term we replace  $I$  with. For type 2,  $D$  retains its infinite extension when we use  $t$  to replace  $I$ . To sum up, for any input variable  $I$  whose substitution chain is of type 1 or of type 2, there is a ground term  $t$  such that replacing  $I$  with  $t$  does not affect the infinite extension of  $D$ . In this case, replacing  $I$  in  $D$  with  $t$  leads to an infinite derivation less general than  $D$ .

For type 3, note that all variables appearing in the  $f_i(\cdot)$ s are input variables. Since  $f_n(\dots, Y_n, \dots)$  is the last non-ground function in the substitution chain for  $I$  in  $D$ , the substitution chain for every variable  $Y_n$  in  $f_n(\dots, Y_n, \dots)$  is either of type 1 or of type 2. Therefore, we can replace each  $Y_n$  with an appropriate ground term  $t_n$  without affecting the infinite extension of  $D$ . After this replacement,  $D$  becomes  $D_n$  and  $f_n(\dots, Y_n, \dots)$  becomes a ground term  $f_n(\dots, t_n, \dots)$ . Now  $f_{n-1}(\dots, Y_{n-1}, \dots)$  is the last non-ground function in the substitution chain for  $I$  in  $D_n$ . Repeating the above replacement recursively, we will obtain an infinite derivation  $D_1$ , which is  $D$  with all variables in the  $f_i(\cdot)$ s replaced with a ground term. Assume  $f_1(\dots, Y_1, \dots)$  becomes a ground term  $t$  in  $D_1$ . Then the substitution chain for  $I$  in  $D_1$  is of type 2. So replacing  $I$  with  $t$  in  $D_1$  leads to an infinite derivation  $D_0$ .

The above constructive proof shows that if the substitution chains for all input variables in  $D$  are of type 1, 2 or 3, then  $D$  must have an infinite moded instance. Since  $D$  has no infinite moded instance, there must exist an input variable  $I$  whose substitution chain in  $D$  is of type 4. That is,  $I$  is recursively substituted by an infinite number of functions. Note that some  $f_i$ s would be the same because a logic program has only a finite number of function symbols. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

We are ready to introduce the following principal result.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $MF_{Q_0}$  and  $MT_{Q_0}$  be the moded-query forest and the moded generalized SLDNF-tree of  $P$  for  $Q_0$ , respectively.  $MF_{Q_0}$  has an infinite derivation if and only if  $MT_{Q_0}$  has an infinite derivation  $D$  of the form*

$$N_0 : G_0 \Rightarrow_{C_0} \dots N_{g_1} : G_{g_1} \Rightarrow_{C_1} \dots N_{g_2} : G_{g_2} \Rightarrow_{C_2} \dots N_{g_3} : G_{g_3} \Rightarrow_{C_3} \dots (3.2)$$

where (i) for any  $j \geq 1$ ,  $G_{g_{j+1}}$  is a loop goal of  $G_{g_j}$ , and (ii) for no input variable  $I$ ,  $D$  contains an infinite chain of substitutions for  $I$  of form (3.1).  $\square$

*Proof.* ( $\implies$ ) Assume  $MF_{Q_0}$  has an infinite derivation  $D'$ . By Theorem 3.2,  $GT_{G_0}$  has an infinite derivation  $D$  with  $D'$  as a moded instance. By Theorem 3.1,  $D$  is of form (3.2) and satisfies condition (i).

Assume, on the contrary, that  $D$  does not satisfy condition (ii). That is, for some input variable  $I$ ,  $D$  contains an infinite chain of substitutions for  $I$  of the form

$$I/f_1(\dots, Y_1, \dots), \dots, Y_1/f_2(\dots, Y_2, \dots), \dots, Y_{i-1}/f_i(\dots, Y_i, \dots), \dots$$

Note that for whatever ground term  $t$  we assign to  $I$ , this chain can be instantiated at most as long in length as the following one:

$$t/f_1(\dots, t_1, \dots), \dots, t_1/f_2(\dots, t_2, \dots), \dots, t_k/f_{k+1}(\dots, Y_{k+1}, \dots)$$

where  $k = |t|$ ,  $t_i$ s are ground terms and  $|t_k| = 1$ . This means that replacing  $I$  with any ground term  $t$  leads to a finite moded instance of  $D$ . Therefore,  $D$  has no infinite moded instance in  $MF_{Q_0}$ , a contradiction.

( $\impliedby$ ) Assume, on the contrary, that  $MF_{Q_0}$  has no infinite derivation. By Lemma 3.1, we reach a contradiction to condition (ii).  $\square$

Theorem 3.3 provides a necessary and sufficient characterization of an infinite generalized SLDNF-derivation for a moded query. Note that it coincides with Theorem 3.1 when  $Q_0$  is a concrete query, where  $MF_{Q_0} = MT_{Q_0}$  and condition (ii) is always true.

The following corollary is immediate to this theorem.

**Corollary 3.1.** *A logic program  $P$  terminates for a moded query  $Q_0$  if and only if the moded generalized SLDNF-tree  $MT_{Q_0}$  has no infinite derivation of form (3.2) satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3.3.  $\square$*

We use simple yet typical examples to illustrate the proposed characterization of infinite SLDNF-derivations with moded queries.



**Example 3.4.** Consider the moded generalized SLDNF-tree  $MT_{Q_0}$  in Figure 3.4. It has only one infinite derivation, which satisfies condition (i) of Theorem 3.3 where for each  $j \geq 0$ ,  $N_{g_j}$  in Theorem 3.3 corresponds to  $N_{2j}$  in Figure 3.4. However, the chain of substitutions for  $I$  in this derivation violates condition (ii). This means that  $MF_{Q_0}$  contains no infinite derivations; therefore, there is no infinite derivation for the moded query  $p(\mathcal{I})$ . As a result,  $P_1$  terminates for  $p(\mathcal{I})$ .  $\square$

**Example 3.5.** Consider the following logic program:

$$\begin{aligned} P_2 : \quad & \text{append}([], X, X). & C_{a_1} \\ & \text{append}([X|Y], U, [X|Z]) \leftarrow \text{append}(Y, U, Z). & C_{a_2} \end{aligned}$$

Let us choose the three simplest moded queries:

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0^1 &= \text{append}(\mathcal{I}, V_2, V_3), \\ Q_0^2 &= \text{append}(V_1, \mathcal{I}, V_3), \\ Q_0^3 &= \text{append}(V_1, V_2, \mathcal{I}). \end{aligned}$$

Since applying clause  $C_{a_1}$  produces only leaf nodes, for simplicity we ignore it when depicting moded generalized SLDNF-trees. The three moded generalized SLDNF-trees  $MT_{Q_0^1}$ ,  $MT_{Q_0^2}$  and  $MT_{Q_0^3}$  are shown in Figures 3.5 (a), (b) and (c), respectively. Note that all the derivations are infinite and satisfy condition (i) of Theorem 3.3, where for each  $j \geq 0$ ,  $N_{g_j}$  in Theorem 3.3 corresponds to  $N_j$  in Figure 3.5. Apparently, the chains of substitutions for  $I$  in the derivations of  $MT_{Q_0^1}$  and  $MT_{Q_0^3}$  violate condition (ii) of Theorem 3.3.  $MF_{Q_0^1}$  and  $MF_{Q_0^3}$  contain no infinite derivation and thus there exists no infinite derivation for the moded queries  $Q_0^1$  and  $Q_0^3$ . Therefore,  $P_2$  terminates for  $Q_0^1$  and  $Q_0^3$ . However, the derivation in  $MT_{Q_0^2}$  satisfies condition (ii), thus there exist infinite derivations for the moded query  $Q_0^2$ .  $P_2$  does not terminate for  $Q_0^2$ .  $\square$

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| $N_0: \text{append}(\mathcal{I}, V_2, V_3)$<br>$C_{a_2} \downarrow \theta_0 = \{\mathcal{I}/[X Y],$<br>$U/V_2, V_3/[X Z]\}$<br>$N_1: \text{append}(Y, V_2, Z)$<br>$C_{a_2} \downarrow \theta_1 = \{Y/[X_1 Y_1],$<br>$U_1/V_2, Z/[X_1 Z_1]\}$<br>$N_2: \text{append}(\underline{Y}_1, V_2, Z_1)$ | $N_0: \text{append}(V_1, \mathcal{I}, V_3)$<br>$C_{a_2} \downarrow \theta_0 = \{V_1/[X Y],$<br>$U/\mathcal{I}, V_3/[X Z]\}$<br>$N_1: \text{append}(Y, \mathcal{I}, Z)$<br>$C_{a_2} \downarrow \theta_1 = \{Y/[X_1 Y_1],$<br>$U_1/\mathcal{I}, Z/[X_1 Z_1]\}$<br>$N_2: \text{append}(Y_1, \mathcal{I}, Z_1)$ | $N_0: \text{append}(V_1, V_2, \mathcal{I})$<br>$C_{a_2} \downarrow \theta_0 = \{V_1/[X Y],$<br>$U/V_2, \mathcal{I}/[X Z]\}$<br>$N_1: \text{append}(Y, V_2, Z)$<br>$C_{a_2} \downarrow \theta_1 = \{Y/[X_1 Y_1],$<br>$U_1/V_2, \underline{Z}/[X_1 Z_1]\}$<br>$N_2: \text{append}(Y_1, V_2, \underline{Z}_1)$ |
| (a)   | (b)   | (c)   |

Figure 3.5: (a)  $MT_{Q_0^1}$ , (b)  $MT_{Q_0^2}$ , and (c)  $MT_{Q_0^3}$ .

Let  $\text{pred}(P)$  be the set of predicate symbols in  $P$ . Define

$$MQ(P) = \{p(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_m, X_{m+1}, \dots, X_n) \mid p \text{ is an } n\text{-ary predicate symbol in } \text{pred}(P) \text{ and } m > 0\}.$$

Note that  $MQ(P)$  contains all most general moded queries of  $P$  in the sense that any moded query of  $P$  is an instance of some query in  $MQ(P)$ . Since  $\text{pred}(P)$  is finite,  $MQ(P)$  is finite. Therefore, it is immediate that  $P$  terminates for all moded queries if and only if it terminates for each moded query in  $MQ(P)$ . Note that there is no restriction on the argument positions on which we allow input modes. In example,  $MQ(P)$  also contains queries such as  $p(X_1, \mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_m, X_{m+2}, \dots, X_n)$ . To simplify the notation however, moded atoms are represented as having the input modes on the first arguments if possible.

**Theorem 3.4.** *For any two moded queries  $Q_0^1 = p(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_l, X_{l+1}, \dots, X_n)$  and  $Q_0^2 = p(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_m, X_{m+1}, \dots, X_n)$  with  $l < m$ , that there is no infinite derivation for  $Q_0^1$  implies there is no infinite derivation for  $Q_0^2$ .*  $\square$

*Proof.* Note that we consider only non-floundering queries. Then, for any concrete query  $Q$ , that there is no infinite derivation for  $Q$  implies there is no infinite derivation for any instance of  $Q$ . Assume that there is no infinite derivation for  $Q_0^1$ . Then, there is no infinite derivation for any query  $Q = p(t_1, \dots, t_l, X_{l+1}, \dots, X_n)$ , where each  $t_i$  is a ground term from  $HU(P)$ . Then, there is no infinite derivation for any query  $Q' = p(t_1, \dots, t_l, s_{l+1}, \dots, s_m, X_{m+1}, \dots, X_n)$ , where each  $t_i$  is a ground term from  $HU(P)$  and each  $s_i$  an instance of  $X_i$ . Since all  $X_i$ s are variables, there is no infinite derivation for any query  $Q'' = p(t_1, \dots, t_l, t_{l+1}, \dots, t_m, X_{m+1}, \dots, X_n)$ , where each  $t_i$  is a ground term from  $HU(P)$ . That is, there is no infinite derivation for  $Q_0^2$ .  $\square$

Applying this theorem, we can conclude that  $P_2$  in Example 3.5 terminates for all moded queries in  $MQ(P_2)$  except  $Q_0^2$ .

### 3.3 An Algorithm for Predicting Termination of Logic Programs

We develop an algorithm for predicting termination of logic programs based on the necessary and sufficient characterization of an infinite generalized SLDNF-derivation (Theorem 3.3 and Corollary 3.1). We begin by introducing a complete loop checking mechanism.

**Definition 3.7.** Given a repetition number  $r \geq 2$ , *LP-check* is defined as follows: Any derivation  $D$  in a generalized SLDNF-tree is cut at a node  $N_{g_r}$  if

$D$  has a prefix of the form

$$N_0 : G_0 \Rightarrow_{C_0} \dots N_{g_1} : G_{g_1} \Rightarrow_{C_k} \dots N_{g_2} : G_{g_2} \Rightarrow_{C_k} \dots N_{g_r} : G_{g_r} \Rightarrow_{C_k} \quad (3.3)$$

such that (a) for any  $j < r$ ,  $G_{g_{j+1}}$  is a loop goal of  $G_{g_j}$ , and (b) for all  $j \leq r$ , the clause  $C_k$  applied to  $G_{g_j}$  is the same.  $C_k$  is then called a *looping clause*.  $\square$

LP-check predicts infinite derivations from prefixes of derivations based on the characterization of Theorem 3.1 (or condition (i) of Theorem 3.3). The repetition number  $r$  specifies the minimum number of loop goals appearing in the prefixes. It appears not appropriate to choose  $r < 2$ , as that may lead to many finite derivations being wrongly cut. Although there is no mathematical mechanism available for choosing this repetition number (since the termination problem is undecidable), our experimental results show that in many situations, it suffices to choose  $r = 3$  for a correct prediction of infinite derivations.

LP-check applies to any generalized SLDNF-trees including moded generalized SLDNF-trees.

**Theorem 3.5.** *LP-check is a complete loop check.*  $\square$

**Proof:** Let  $D$  be an infinite derivation in  $GT_{G_0}$ . By Theorem 3.1,  $D$  is of the form

$$N_0 : G_0 \Rightarrow_{C_0} \dots N_{f_1} : G_{f_1} \Rightarrow_{C_1} \dots N_{f_2} : G_{f_2} \Rightarrow_{C_2} \dots$$

such that for any  $i \geq 1$ ,  $G_{f_{i+1}}$  is a loop goal of  $G_{f_i}$ . Since a logic program has only a finite number of clauses, there must be a (looping) clause  $C_k$  being repeatedly applied at infinitely many nodes  $N_{g_1} : G_{g_1}, N_{g_2} : G_{g_2}, \dots$  where for each  $j \geq 1$ ,  $g_j \in \{f_1, f_2, \dots\}$ . Then for any  $r > 0$ ,  $D$  has a partial derivation of form (3.3). So  $D$  will be cut at node  $N_{g_r} : G_{g_r}$ . This shows that any infinite derivation can be cut by LP-check. That is, LP-check is a complete loop check.  $\square$

**Example 3.6.** Let us choose  $r = 3$  and consider the infinite derivation  $D$  in Figure 3.4.  $p(X_4)$  at  $N_4$  is a loop goal of  $p(X_2)$  at  $N_2$  that is a loop goal of  $p(I)$  at  $N_0$ . Moreover, the same clause  $C_{p_2}$  is applied at the three nodes.  $D$  satisfies the conditions of LP-check and is cut at node  $N_4$ .  $\square$

Recall that to prove that a logic program  $P$  terminates for a moded query  $Q_0 = p(\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_m, T_1, \dots, T_n)$  is to prove that  $P$  terminates for any query  $p(t_1, \dots, t_m, T_2, \dots, T_n)$ , where each  $t_i$  is a ground term. This can be reformulated in terms of a moded-query forest; that is,  $P$  terminates for  $Q_0$  if and only if  $MF_{Q_0}$  has no infinite derivation. Then, Corollary 3.1 shows that  $P$  terminates for  $Q_0$  if and

only if the moded generalized SLDNF-tree  $MT_{Q_0}$  has no infinite derivation  $D$  of form (3.2) satisfying the two conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3.3. Although this characterization cannot be directly used for automated termination test because it requires generating infinite derivations in  $MT_{Q_0}$ , it can be used along with LP-check to predict termination, as LP-check is able to guess if a partial derivation would extend to an infinite one. Before describing our prediction algorithm with this idea, we introduce one more condition following Definition 3.7.

**Definition 3.8.** Let  $D$  be a prefix of form (3.3).  $D$  is said to have the *term-size decrease* property if for any  $i$  with  $0 < i < r$ , there is a substitution  $X/f(...Y...)$  between  $N_{g_i}$  and  $N_{g_{i+1}}$ , where  $X$  is an input variable and  $Y$  (an ordinary or input variable) appears in the selected subgoal of  $G_{g_{i+1}}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.6.** Let  $D$  be a derivation such that for all  $r \geq 2$   $D$  has a prefix of form (3.3) which has the term-size decrease property.  $D$  contains an infinite chain of substitutions of form (3.1) for some input variable  $I$  at the root node of  $D$ .  $\square$

*Proof.* Due to the term-size decrease property of the prefix of  $D$  which holds for all  $r \geq 2$ ,  $D$  contains an infinite number of substitutions of the form  $X/f(...)$ , where  $X$  is an input variable. Assume, on the contrary, that  $D$  does not contain such an infinite chain of form (3.1). Let  $M$  be the longest length of substitutions of form (3.1) for each input variable  $I$  at the root node of  $D$ . Note that each input variable can be substituted only by a constant or function. For each substitution  $X/f(...)$  with  $X$  an input variable, assume  $f(...)$  contains at most  $N$  variables (i.e., it introduces at most  $N$  new input variables). Then,  $D$  contains at most  $K * (N^0 + N^1 + ... + N^M)$  substitutions of the form  $X/f(...)$ , where  $K$  is the number of input variables at the root node of  $D$  and  $X$  is an input variable. This contradicts the condition that  $D$  contains an infinite number of such substitutions. We conclude the proof.  $\square$

LP-check and the term-size decrease property approximate conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3.3, respectively. So, we can guess an infinite extension (3.2) from a prefix (3.3) by combining the two mechanisms, as described in the following algorithm.

**Algorithm 3.1.** *Input:* A logic program  $P$ , a (concrete or moded) query  $Q_0$ , and a repetition number  $r \geq 2$  ( $r = 3$  is recommended).

*Output:* terminating, predicted-terminating, or predicted-non-terminating.

*Method:* Apply the following procedure.

*procedure* TPoLP( $P, Q_0, r$ )

{

1. Initially, set  $L = 0$ . Construct the moded generalized SLDNF-tree  $MT_{Q_0}$  of  $P$  for  $Q_0$  in the way that whenever a prefix  $D$  of the form

$$N_0 : G_0 \Rightarrow_{C_0} \dots N_{g_1} : G_{g_1} \Rightarrow_{C_k} \dots N_{g_2} : G_{g_2} \Rightarrow_{C_k} \dots N_{g_r} : G_{g_r} \Rightarrow_{C_k}$$

is produced which satisfies conditions (a) and (b) of LP-check, if  $D$  does not have the term-size decrease property then goto 3; else set  $L = 1$  and extend  $D$  from the node  $N_{g_r}$  with the looping clause  $C_k$  skipped and continue with the construction of the tree of step 1.

2. Return terminating if  $L = 0$ ; otherwise, return predicted-terminating.
3. Return predicted-non-terminating.

}

□

Starting from the root node  $N_0 : G_0$ , we generate derivations of a moded generalized SLDNF-tree  $MT_{Q_0}$  step by step. If a prefix  $D$  of form (3.3) is generated which satisfies conditions (a) and (b) of LP-check, then by Theorem 3.1  $D$  is very likely to extend infinitely in  $MT_{Q_0}$  (via the looping clause  $C_k$ ). By Theorem 3.2, however,  $D$  may not have infinite moded instances in  $MF_{Q_0}$ . So in this case, we further check if  $D$  has the term-size decrease property. If not, by Theorem 3.3  $D$  is very likely to have moded instances that extend infinitely in  $MF_{Q_0}$ . Algorithm 3.1 then predicts non-terminating for  $Q_0$  by returning an answer *predicted-non-terminating*. If  $D$  has the term-size decrease property, however, we continue to extend  $D$  from  $N_{g_r}$  by skipping the clause  $C_k$  (i.e., the derivation via  $C_k$  is cut at  $N_{g_r}$  by LP-check).

When the answer is not *predicted-non-terminating*, we distinguish between two cases: (1)  $L = 0$ . This shows that no derivation was cut by LP-check during the construction of  $MT_{Q_0}$ . Algorithm 3.1 concludes terminating for  $Q_0$  by returning an answer *terminating*. (2)  $L = 1$ . This means that some derivations were cut by LP-check, all of which have the term-size decrease property. Algorithm 3.1 then predicts terminating for  $Q_0$  by returning an answer *predicted-terminating*.

Note that for a concrete query  $Q_0$ , no derivation has the term-size decrease property. Therefore, Algorithm 3.1 returns *predicted-non-terminating* for  $Q_0$  once a prefix of a derivation satisfying the conditions of LP-check is generated.

**Theorem 3.7.** *For any logic program  $P$ , concrete/moded query  $Q_0$  and repetition number  $r$ , Algorithm 3.1 always terminates.* □

*Proof.* Algorithm 3.1 constructs  $MT_{Q_0}$  while applying LP-check to cut possible infinite derivations. Since LP-check is a complete loop check, it cuts all infinite

derivations at some depth. This means that  $MT_{Q_0}$  after cut by LP-check is finite. So, Algorithm 3.1 always terminates.  $\square$

Algorithm 3.1 yields an approximate answer, *predicted-terminating* or *predicted-non-terminating*, or an exact answer *terminating*, as shown by the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.8.** *P terminates for  $Q_0$  if Algorithm 3.1 returns terminating.*  $\square$

*Proof.* If Algorithm 3.1 returns *terminating*, no derivations were cut by LP-check; so the moded generalized SLDNF-tree  $MT_{Q_0}$  for  $Q_0$  is finite. By Corollary 3.1,  $P$  terminates for  $Q_0$ .  $\square$

In the following examples, we choose a repetition number  $r = 3$ .

**Example 3.7.** Consider Figure 3.4. Since the prefix  $D$  between  $N_0$  and  $N_4$  satisfies the conditions of LP-check, Algorithm 3.1 concludes that the derivation may extend infinitely in  $MT_{Q_0}$ . It then checks the term-size decrease property to see if  $D$  has moded instances that would extend infinitely in  $MF_{Q_0}$ . Clearly,  $D$  has the term-size decrease property. So Algorithm 3.1 skips  $C_{p_2}$  at  $N_4$  (the branch is cut by LP-check). Consequently, Algorithm 3.1 predicts terminating for  $p(\mathcal{I})$  by returning an answer *predicted-terminating*. This prediction is correct; see Example 3.4.  $\square$

**Example 3.8.** Consider Figure 3.5. All the derivations starting at  $N_0$  and ending at  $N_2$  satisfy the conditions of LP-check, so they are cut at  $N_2$ . Since the derivations in  $MT_{Q_0^1}$  and  $MT_{Q_0^3}$  have the term-size decrease property, Algorithm 3.1 returns *predicted-terminating* for  $Q_0^1$  and  $Q_0^3$ . Since the derivation in  $MT_{Q_0^2}$  does not have the term-size decrease property, Algorithm 3.1 returns *predicted-non-terminating* for  $Q_0^2$ . These predictions are all correct; see Example 3.5.  $\square$

**Example 3.9.** Consider the following logic program  $P_3$ :

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 mult(s(X), Y, Z) \leftarrow mult(X, Y, U), add(U, Y, Z). & C_{m_1} \\
 mult(0, Y, 0). & C_{m_2} \\
 add(s(X), Y, s(Z)) \leftarrow add(X, Y, Z). & C_{a_1} \\
 add(0, Y, Y). & C_{a_2}
 \end{array}$$

$MQ(P_3)$  consists of fourteen moded queries, seven for predicate *mult* and seven for predicate *add*. Applying Algorithm 3.1 yields the following result: (1)  $P_3$  is *predicted-terminating* for all moded queries to *add* except  $add(V_1, \mathcal{I}_2, V_3)$

for which  $P_3$  is *predicted-non-terminating*, and (2)  $P_3$  is *predicted-terminating* for  $\text{mult}(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2, V_3)$  and  $\text{mult}(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2, \mathcal{I}_3)$ , but is *predicted-non-terminating* for the remaining moded queries to  $\text{mult}$ . For illustration, we depict two moded generalized SLDNF-trees for  $\text{mult}(\mathcal{I}, V_2, V_3)$  and  $\text{mult}(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2, V_3)$ , as shown in Figures 3.6 (a) and (b), respectively. In the two moded generalized SLDNF-trees, the prefix from  $N_0$  down to  $N_2$  satisfies the conditions of LP-check and has the term-size decrease property, so clause  $C_{m_1}$  is skipped when expanding  $N_2$ . When the derivation is extended to  $N_6$ , the conditions of LP-check are satisfied again, where  $G_6$  is a loop goal of  $G_5$  that is a loop goal of  $G_4$ . Since the derivation for  $\text{mult}(\mathcal{I}, V_2, V_3)$  (Figure 3.6 (a)) does not have the term-size decrease property, Algorithm 3.1 returns an answer, *predicted-non-terminating*, for this moded query. The derivation for  $\text{mult}(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2, V_3)$  (Figure 3.6 (b)) has the term-size decrease property, so clause  $C_{a_1}$  is skipped when expanding  $N_6$ . For simplicity, we omitted all derivations leading to a success leaf. Because all derivations satisfying the conditions of LP-check have the term-size decrease property, Algorithm 3.1 ends with an answer, *predicted-terminating*, for  $\text{mult}(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2, V_3)$ . It is then immediately inferred by Theorem 3.4 that  $P_3$  is *predicted-terminating* for  $\text{mult}(\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2, \mathcal{I}_3)$ . It is not difficult to verify that all these predictions are correct.  $\square$




Figure 3.6: Two moded generalized SLDNF-trees of  $P_3$  generated by Algorithm 3.1.

AProVE07 [23], NTI [38, 37], Polytool [35] and TALP [36] are four well-known state-of-the-art analyzers. NTI proves non-termination, while the others prove termination. The Termination Competition 2007 [1] reports their latest performance. We borrow three representative logic programs from the competition website to further demonstrate the effectiveness of our termination prediction.

**Example 3.10.** Consider the following logic program coming from the Termination Competition 2007 with Problem id *LP/talp/apt - subset1* and difficulty rating 100%.

AProVE07, NTI, Polytool and TALP all failed to prove/disprove its termination by yielding an answer “don’t know” in the competition [1].

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 P_4 : & \text{member1}(X, [Y|Xs]) \leftarrow \text{member1}(X, Xs). & C_{m_1} \\
 & \text{member1}(X, [X|Xs]). & C_{m_2} \\
 & \text{subset1}([X|Xs], Ys) : \neg \text{member1}(X, Ys), \text{subset1}(Xs, Ys). & C_{s_1} \\
 & \text{subset1}([], Ys). & C_{s_2} \\
 \text{Query Mode: } & \text{subset1}(o, i).
 \end{array}$$

The query mode  $\text{subset1}(o, i)$  means that the second argument of any query must be a ground term, while the first one can be an arbitrary term. Then, to prove the termination property of  $P_4$  with this query mode is to prove the termination for the moded query  $Q_0 = \text{subset1}(V, \mathcal{I})$ . Applying Algorithm 3.1 generates a moded generalized SLDNF-tree as shown in Figure 3.7. The prefix from  $N_0$  down to  $N_3$  satisfies the conditions of LP-check and has the term-size decrease property, so clause  $C_{m_1}$  is skipped when expanding  $N_3$ . When the derivation is extended to  $N_{10}$ , the conditions of LP-check are satisfied again, where  $G_{10}$  is a loop goal of  $G_9$  that is a loop goal of  $G_8$ . Since the derivation has the term-size decrease property,  $N_{10}$  is expanded by  $C_{m_2}$ .

At  $N_{11}$  (resp.  $N_{13}$  and  $N_{15}$ ), the derivation satisfies the conditions of LP-check and has the term-size decrease property, where  $G_{11}$  (resp.  $N_{13}$  and  $N_{15}$ ) is a loop goal of  $G_4$  that is a loop goal of  $G_0$ . Therefore,  $N_{11}$  (resp.  $N_{13}$  and  $N_{15}$ ) is expanded by  $C_{s_2}$ . When the derivation is extended to  $N_{17}$ , the conditions of LP-check are satisfied, where  $G_{17}$  is a loop goal of  $G_4$  that is a loop goal of  $G_0$ , but the term-size decrease condition is violated. Algorithm 3.1 stops immediately with an answer, *predicted-non-terminating*, for the query  $Q_0$ . It is easy to verify that this prediction is correct.  $\square$

**Example 3.11.** Consider another logic program in the Termination Competition 2007 with Problem id *LP/SGST06 - incomplete* and difficulty rating 75%. Polytool succeeded to prove its termination, while AProVE07, NTI and TALP failed [1].

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 P_5 : & p(X) \leftarrow q(f(Y)), p(Y). & C_{p_1} \\
 & p(g(X)) \leftarrow p(X). & C_{p_2} \\
 & q(g(Y)). & C_{q_1} \\
 \text{Query Mode: } & p(i).
 \end{array}$$






Figure 3.7: The moded generalized SLDNF-tree of  $P_4$  generated by Algorithm 3.1.

To prove the termination property of  $P_5$  with this query mode is to prove the termination for the moded query  $Q_0 = p(\mathcal{I})$ . Applying Algorithm 3.1 generates a moded generalized SLDNF-tree as shown in Figure 3.8. The prefix from  $N_0$  down to  $N_4$  satisfies the conditions of LP-check and has the term-size decrease property, so clause  $C_{p_2}$  is skipped when expanding  $N_4$ . Algorithm 3.1 yields an answer *predicted-terminating* for the query  $Q_0$ . This prediction is correct.  $\square$

**Example 3.12.** Consider a third logic program from the Termination Competition 2007 with Problem id *LP/SGST06 - incomplete2* and difficulty rating 75%. In contrast to Example 3.11, for this program AProVE07 succeeded to prove its termination, while Polytool, NTI and TALP failed [1].

$$\begin{array}{ll}
P_6: & f(X) \leftarrow g(s(s(s(X)))). & C_{f_1} \\
& f(s(X)) \leftarrow f(X). & C_{f_2} \\
& g(s(s(s(s(X))))) \leftarrow f(X). & C_{g_1}
\end{array}$$




Figure 3.8: The moded generalized SLDNF-tree of  $P_5$  generated by Algorithm 3.1.

Query Mode:  $f(i)$ .

To prove the termination property of  $P_6$  with this query mode is to prove the termination for the moded query  $Q_0 = f(\underline{I})$ . Applying Algorithm 3.1 generates a moded generalized SLDNF-tree as shown in Figure 3.9.  $C_{f_1}$  and/or  $C_{f_2}$  is skipped at  $N_4, N_5, N_6, N_9, N_{10}, N_{11}, N_{13}, N_{18}, N_{19}, N_{20}, N_{22}, N_{23}, N_{25}$  and  $N_{27}$ , due to the occurrence of the following prefixes which satisfy both the conditions of LP-check and the term-size decrease condition:

1.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_2 : f(\underline{X}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_4 : f(\underline{X_1}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}}$
2.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_2 : f(\underline{X}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_5 : f(\underline{X_2}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}}$
3.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_2 : f(\underline{X}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_6 : f(\underline{X_3}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}}$
4.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_4 : f(\underline{X_1}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_5 : f(\underline{X_2}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_6 : f(\underline{X_3}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}}$
5.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_7 : f(\underline{X_1}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_9 : f(\underline{X_2}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}}$
6.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_7 : f(\underline{X_1}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_{10} : f(\underline{X_3}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}}$
7.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_2 : f(\underline{X}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} \dots N_9 : f(\underline{X_2}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_{10} : f(\underline{X_3}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}}$
8.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_{11} : f(\underline{X_2}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_{13} : f(\underline{X_3}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}}$
9.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_2 : f(\underline{X}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_7 : f(\underline{X_1}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} \dots N_{13} : f(\underline{X_3}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}}$
10.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_2 : f(\underline{X}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_7 : f(\underline{X_1}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_{11} : f(\underline{X_2}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}}$
11.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_{14} : f(\underline{X}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_{16} : f(\underline{X_1}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_{18} : f(\underline{X_2}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}}$
12.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_{14} : f(\underline{X}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_{16} : f(\underline{X_1}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_{19} : f(\underline{X_3}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}}$
13.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} \dots N_{18} : f(\underline{X_2}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_{19} : f(\underline{X_3}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}}$
14.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_{14} : f(\underline{X}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_{20} : f(\underline{X_2}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_{22} : f(\underline{X_3}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}}$
15.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} \dots N_{16} : f(\underline{X_1}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} \dots N_{22} : f(\underline{X_3}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}}$
16.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} \dots N_{16} : f(\underline{X_1}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_{20} : f(\underline{X_2}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}}$
17.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} \dots N_{23} : f(\underline{X_1}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_{25} : f(\underline{X_2}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}} \dots N_{27} : f(\underline{X_3}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_1}}$
18.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_{14} : f(\underline{X}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} \dots N_{27} : f(\underline{X_3}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}}$
19.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_{14} : f(\underline{X}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} \dots N_{25} : f(\underline{X_2}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}}$
20.  $N_0 : f(\underline{I}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} N_{14} : f(\underline{X}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}} \dots N_{23} : f(\underline{X_1}) \Rightarrow_{C_{f_2}}$

Since there is no derivation satisfying the conditions of LP-check while violating the term-size decrease condition, Algorithm 3.1 ends with an answer *predicted-terminating* for the query  $Q_0$ . This again is a correct prediction.  $\square$




Figure 3.9: The moded generalized SLDNF-tree of  $P_6$  generated by Algorithm 3.1.

We should remark that although for all benchmark programs of the Termination Competition 2007, choosing a repetition number  $r = 3$  is enough for Algorithm 3.1 to produce a correct prediction, due to the undecidability of the termination problem, there exist cases that Algorithm 3.1 would make an incorrect prediction unless a big repetition number is used. Consider the following carefully crafted logic program:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
 P_7 : & p(f(X), Y) \leftarrow p(X, s(Y)). & C_{p_1} \\
 & p(Z, \underbrace{s(s(\dots s(0)\dots))}_{100 \text{ items}}) \leftarrow q. & C_{p_2} \\
 & q \leftarrow q. & C_{q_1}
 \end{array}$$

$P_7$  does not terminate for a moded query  $Q_0 = p(I, 0)$ , as there is an infinite derivation

$$N_0 : p(I, 0) \Rightarrow_{C_{p_1}} \dots N_{101} : q \Rightarrow_{C_{q_1}} N_{102} : q \Rightarrow_{C_{q_1}} \dots$$

(see Figure 3.10) which satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3.3, where for any  $j \geq 101$ ,  $G_{j+1}$  is a loop goal of  $G_j$ . Note that for any repetition number  $r$  with  $3 \leq r \leq 100$ , the prefix ending at  $N_{r-1}$  satisfies both the conditions of

LP-check and the term-size decrease property, where for any  $j$  with  $0 \leq j < r-1$ ,  $G_{j+1}$  is a loop goal of  $G_j$ . However, for any  $r > 100$ , a prefix ending at  $N_{100+r}$  will be encountered, which satisfies the conditions of LP-check but violates the term-size decrease condition, where for any  $j$  with  $101 \leq j < 100 + r$ ,  $G_{j+1}$  is a loop goal of  $G_j$ . Therefore, Algorithm 3.1 will return *predicted-terminating* for  $Q_0$  unless the repetition number  $r$  is set above 100.




Figure 3.10: The moded generalized SLDNF-tree of  $P_7$  with a moded query  $p(\underline{I}, 0)$ .

The following results shows that choosing a sufficiently large repetition number guarantees the correct prediction for non-terminating programs.

**Theorem 3.9.** *Let  $P$  be a logic program and  $Q$  be a query such that  $P$  is non-terminating for  $Q$ . There always exists a number  $R$  such that Algorithm 3.1 with any repetition number  $r \geq R$  produces the answer *predicted-non-terminating*.  $\square$*

*Proof.* Let us assume the contrary. That is, we assume that for any number  $N$ , there exists a larger number  $r$  such that Algorithm 3.1 for  $P$  with query  $Q$  and repetition number  $r$  produces the answer *predicted – terminating*. This means that for all  $r \geq 2$  the prefix of form 3.3 for some input variable  $I$  at  $Q$ . This means that  $D$  does not satisfy condition (ii) of Theorem 3.6. However, since  $P$  is non-terminating for  $Q$ , by Corollary 3.1  $MT_Q$  has at least one infinite

branch of form 3.3 satisfying conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 3.3. We have a contradiction and thus conclude the proof.  $\square$

The same result applies for any terminating concrete query  $Q$ . That is, there always exists a number  $R$  such that Algorithm 3.1 with any  $r \geq R$  produces the answer *terminating* or *predicted-terminating* when  $P$  is terminating for  $Q$ . The proof for this is simple. When  $P$  is terminating for a concrete query  $Q$ , the (moded) generalized SLDNF-tree for  $Q$  is finite. Let  $R$  be the number of nodes of the longest branch in the tree. For any  $r \geq R$ , Algorithm 3.1 will produce the answer *terminating* or *predicted-terminating*, since no branch will be cut by LP-check. However, whether the above claim holds for any moded query  $Q$  when  $P$  is terminating remains an interesting open problem.

### 3.4 Experimental Results

We evaluated our termination prediction technique on a benchmark of 301 Prolog programs. First, we describe the benchmark and our experimental results using a straightforward implementation of Algorithm 3.1. Then, we define a pruning technique to reduce the size of the SLDNF-derivation produced by our prediction. Finally, we conclude this section with a comparison between the state-of-the-art termination and non-termination analyzers and our termination prediction tool.

Our benchmark consists of the majority of programs from the termination competition of 2007. Because the termination competition contains programs with non-logical operations such as arithmetics, 23 programs from the competition are omitted. For most of these programs neither termination nor non-termination could be shown by any of the tools in the competition. Our benchmark consists of 301 programs with moded queries: 244 terminating and 57 non-terminating programs. The most accurate termination analyzer of the competition, AProVE [23], proves termination of 238 benchmark programs. The non-termination analyzer NTI [38, 37] proves non-termination of 42 programs. Because the prediction does not produce a termination or non-termination proof, our goal is to outperform the analyzers of the competition.

We implemented our tool, TPoLP: Termination Prediction of Logic Programs, in SWI-prolog [59]. TPoLP is freely available from [2]. The moded SLDNF-derivation is represented by a graph and acquired by following Algorithm 3.1 as described in the last section. The derivation is initialized with the moded query and extended for a maximum of 4 minutes until a branch is found that

does not have the term-size decrease property or until all branches are cut. If no answer is produced in 4 minutes the analysis is stopped and the result is a timeout. To improve the efficiency of the analysis, a number of optimizations were implemented, such as constant time access to the nodes and the arcs of the graph representing the derivation. The experiments have been performed using SWI-Prolog 5.6.40, on an Intel Core2 Duo 2,33GHz, 2 Gb RAM.

| Repetition number:     | 2    | 3     | 4      |
|------------------------|------|-------|--------|
| Correct Predictions:   | 291  | 271   | 234    |
| Wrong Predictions:     | 7    | 0     | 0      |
| Out of time/memory     | 3    | 30    | 67     |
| Average time (Sec):    | 1.7  | 24.9  | 59.3   |
| Average Nb of nodes:   | 5553 | 56467 | 106057 |
| Average Nb of lp cuts: | 4082 | 22666 | 38066  |

Table 3.1: Predictions: full table available at [2]

Table 3.1 gives an overview of the predictions with repetition numbers two, three and four. Two does not suffice as a repetition number because some of the predictions are wrong and we want very reliable predictions. When the repetition number is set to at least three, all predictions made for the benchmark are correct. This shows that in practice, there is no need to increase the repetition number any further. However, the cost of predicting the termination behavior is very high. About 10% of the programs break the time limit of four minutes.

The component of the algorithm taking most of the time differs from program to program. When a lot of branches are cut by LP-check, constructing the LP cuts is usually the bottleneck. For programs with a low amount of LP cuts, most of the time is spend on constructing the SLDNF-derivation. Because some of the constructed SLDNF-derivations count more than a million nodes, we added a component to remove redundant parts of the derivation on backtracking. To reduce the analysis time needed by TPoLP, we implemented a pruning technique to reduce the size of the SLDNF-derivations.

### 3.4.1 Pruning

To explain the intuition behind the pruning technique, we revisit Example 14. Note that the paths  $N_0$  down to  $N_6$ ,  $N_0$  down to  $N_{10}$ , and so on, contain the same rules in a different order. Therefore, it seems that most of these paths are redundant. The idea to prune redundant paths is to ignore clauses if they are already applied to a similar parent or loop goal.

Two versions of the pruning technique are defined. The first version prunes only on variant loop goals. The second version prunes on all loop goals.

**Definition 3.9** (Pruning). *Let  $G2$  be a loop goal of  $G1$  (for which the selected literals have the same symbol string). Then, all clauses except for the looping clause that have already been applied at  $G2$ , are skipped at  $G1$  during backtracking.*  $\square$

**Example 3.13** (SLDNF-Derivation of Example 3.12 with pruning). *See Figure 3.11. The algorithm starts by creating nodes  $N_0$  down to  $N_6$ . All rules unifying with  $f(X_3)$  at  $N_6$  are cut by LP-check. Without the pruning technique we would now apply  $C_{f_2}$  at node  $N_2$ . Because  $N_4$  is a loop goal with identical symbol string of  $N_2$ , we ignore clause  $C_{f_2}$  at node  $N_2$ . We also prune clause  $C_{f_2}$  at node  $N_0$  because  $N_4$  is a loop goal with identical symbol string of  $N_0$ .*

*No more rules can be applied, and the algorithm with pruning ends with the correct answer: predicted terminating. Because all the loop goals in the derivation have identical symbol strings, both pruning techniques construct the same derivation for this example. The derivations with pruning contain 7 nodes, while the derivation without pruning (see Example 3.12) counts 28 nodes.*  $\square$




Figure 3.11: SLDNF-derivation of Example 3.12 with pruning

Table 3.2 gives an overview of our predictions with three as a repetition number: without pruning, with pruning on variant loop goals and pruning on all loop goals. The table shows that pruning is a good tradeoff between the precision and the efficiency of the prediction. When pruning on variant loop goals, the size

|                       | No pruning | Pruning variants | Pruning Loop Goals |
|-----------------------|------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Correct Predictions:  | 271        | 296              | 297                |
| Wrong Predictions:    | 0          | 0                | 3                  |
| Out of time/memory    | 30         | 5                | 1                  |
| Average time (Sec)    | 24.9       | 4.4              | 0.05               |
| Average Nb of nodes   | 56467      | 7800             | 140                |
| Average Nb of lp cuts | 22666      | 380              | 2.8                |

Table 3.2: Pruning: full tables available at [2].

of the derivations drops considerably, while all predictions for the benchmark are still correct. Because the derivations are much smaller, more than 98% of the predictions finish within the time limit. When pruning on all loop goals, the size of the derivation is only a fraction of the derivation without pruning. However, we lose accuracy by pruning on all loop goals: three non-terminating programs are predicted to be terminating. The accuracy does not improve with a higher repetition number.

| Answer                | TPoLP | AProvE [23] | NTI [38, 37] | Polytool | TALP [36] |
|-----------------------|-------|-------------|--------------|----------|-----------|
| Terminating (244):    | 239   | 238         | 0            | 206      | 164       |
| Non-terminating (57): | 57    | 0           | 42           | 0        | 0         |

Table 3.3: Comparison between TPoLP and (non-)termination analyzers.

Table 3.3 gives a comparison between our predictions with pruning on variant loop goals and the state-of-the-art termination and non-termination analyzers. Note that our tool, TPoLP, is the only tool for Logic programs which analyzes both for termination and non-termination. The results are very satisfying. We correctly predict the termination property of all 301 benchmark programs, except for five programs which broke the time limit. It is also worth noticing that for all programs of the benchmark, either an analyzer finds a termination or non-termination proof or a correct prediction is made by our tool. This shows that our prediction tool can be a very useful addition to any termination or non-termination analyzer.

### 3.5 Related Work

Most approaches to the termination problem are *norm-* or *level mapping-based* in the sense that they perform termination analysis by building from the source code



of a logic program some well-founded termination conditions/constraints in terms of norms (i.e. term sizes of atoms of clauses), level mappings, interargument size relations and/or instantiation dependencies, which when solved, yield a termination proof (see, e.g., [16] for a survey and more recent papers [5, 9, 10, 18, 22, 27, 30, 34]). Another main stream is *transformational* approaches, which transform a logic program into a term rewriting system (TRS) and then analyze the termination property of the resulting TRS instead [4, 6, 23, 31, 36, 44, 46, 54]). All of these approaches are used for a termination proof; i.e., they compute sufficient termination conditions which once satisfied, lead to a positive conclusion *terminating*. Recently, Payet and Mesnard [38, 37] propose an approach to computing sufficient non-termination conditions which when satisfied, lead to a negative conclusion *non-terminating*. A majority of these termination/non-termination proof approaches apply only to positive logic programs.

Our approach presented in this chapter differs significantly from previous termination analysis approaches. First, we do not make a termination proof, nor do we make a non-termination proof. Instead, we make a termination prediction (see Figure 3.1) – an approximation approach to attacking the undecidable termination problem. Second, we do not rely on static norms or level mappings, nor do we transform a logic program to a term rewriting system. Instead, we focus on detecting infinite SLDNF-derivations with the understanding that a logic program is terminating for a query if and only if there is no infinite SLDNF-derivation with the query. We have established a necessary and sufficient characterization of infinite SLDNF-derivations with arbitrary (concrete or moded) queries, introduced a new loop checking mechanism, and developed an algorithm that predicts termination of general logic programs with arbitrary queries by identifying potential infinite SLDNF-derivations. Since the algorithm implements the necessary and sufficient conditions (the characterization) of an infinite SLDNF-derivation, its prediction is very effective; see Examples 3.7 - 3.12. Especially, Examples 3.10 - 3.12 demonstrate that our algorithm can make a correct prediction even though some of the state-of-the-art analyzers like AProVE07 [23], NTI [38, 37], Polytool [35] and TALP [36] may fail to prove/disprove it.

Our termination prediction approach uses a loop checking mechanism (a loop check) to implement a characterization of infinite SLDNF-derivations. Well-known loop checks include VA-check [8, 53], OS-check [11, 32, 45], and VAF-checks [49, 52]. All apply to positive logic programs. In particular, VA-check applies to function-free logic programs, where an infinite derivation is characterized by a sequence of selected *variant subgoals*. OS-check identifies an infinite derivation with a sequence of selected subgoals with the same predicate symbol *whose sizes do not decrease*. VAF-checks take a sequence

of selected *expanded variant subgoals* as major characteristics of an infinite derivation. Expanded variant subgoals are variant subgoals except that some terms may grow bigger. In this chapter, a new loop check mechanism, LP-check, is introduced in which an infinite derivation is identified with a sequence of *loop goals*. Most importantly, enhancing LP-check with Condition (c) leads to the first loop check for moded queries.

## 3.6 Summary

We have presented an approximation framework for attacking the undecidable termination problem of logic programs, as an alternative to current termination/non-termination proof approaches. We introduced an idea of termination prediction, established a necessary and sufficient characterization of infinite SLDNF-derivations with arbitrary (concrete or moded) queries, built a new loop checking mechanism, and developed an algorithm that predicts termination of general logic programs with arbitrary queries. We demonstrated the effectiveness of the termination prediction with representative examples including ones borrowed from the Termination Competition 2007.

Our prediction approach can be used standalone, e.g., it may be incorporated into Prolog as a termination debugging tool; or it is used along with some termination/non-termination proof tools (see Figure 3.1).

## Reference

The work in this chapter was published in TPLP [50].

## Chapter 4

# Non-termination Analysis for Logic Programs

This chapter defines a new non-termination analysis which reuses the analysis scheme introduced in the last chapter. Our work has been inspired both by the work on termination prediction and by the work on non-termination inference [38] and its implementation *NTI*. The analysis scheme of the previous Chapter is used to produce a finite representation of the computation for a given logic program and moded query. We introduce a new non-termination condition expressed in terms of this finite representation of the computation. We prove its correctness and extend it to increase its applicability.

It turns out that our characterization of non-terminating computations is more precise than that of *NTI*. We have implemented the technique and performed extensive experiments with it on the basis of the benchmark of the termination analysis competition of 2007 [1]. The experiments show that our technique has a 100% success-rate on this benchmark, outperforming the only competing analyzer, *NTI*.

The chapter is organized as follows. In Section 4.1, we present our conditions implying non-termination and show that we are able to derive classes of non-terminating queries. In Section 4.2, we present our experimental evaluation and we compare our analyzer with the non-termination inference tool *NTI*.

## 4.1 A new non-termination condition

In this section, we present a new non-termination analysis technique for general logic programs with moded queries. A moded query  $Q$  corresponds to a set of concrete queries, called the *denotation* of  $Q$ . We consider a program *non-terminating* w.r.t. a moded query, if the denotation of the query contains at least one concrete query that has an infinite branch in its generalized SLDNF-tree. In the following definition,  $Term_P$  denotes the set of ground terms defined by a program  $P$ .

Let  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  be all input variables occurring in a moded atom  $A$ . Let  $t_1, \dots, t_n \in Term_P$ .  $A(t_1 \rightarrow \underline{I}_1, \dots, t_n \rightarrow \underline{I}_n)$  denotes the concrete atom obtained by replacing the input variables  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  by the terms  $t_1, \dots, t_n$ .

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $A$  be an atom with  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  as its input variables. The *denotation* of  $A$  is

$$Den(A) = \{A(t_1 \rightarrow \underline{I}_1, \dots, t_n \rightarrow \underline{I}_n) \mid t_i \in Term_P, t_i \text{ is ground}\}. \quad \square$$

This concept can be adapted to moded goals, literals in a straightforward way. Note that the denotation of a concrete atom is a singleton containing the atom itself.

### 4.1.1 The moded more general relation

To prove non-termination, we prove that a path between two nodes  $N_b$  and  $N_e$  in a moded SLDNF-derivation can be repeated infinitely often. To find such a path, we check three properties. Because the rules in the path must be applicable independent of the values of the input variables, no substitutions on the input variables may occur in the path from  $N_b$  to  $N_e$ . Because this path should be a loop, the selected literal of  $N_b$  must be an ancestor of the selected literal of  $N_e$ . Finally, a special more general relation for moded atoms must hold between the selected literals of  $N_b$  and  $N_e$ . We will show that these three conditions imply non-termination.

A moded atom  $A$  is *moded more general* than a moded atom  $B$ , if any atom in the denotation of  $A$  is more general than some atom in the denotation of  $B$ . This means that for each atom  $I$  in the denotation of  $A$ , there must exist a substitution  $\theta$  such that  $I\theta$  is in the denotation of  $B$ .

**Definition 4.2.** A moded atom  $A$  is *moded more general* than a moded atom  $B$  w.r.t. a program  $P$ ,  $A \triangleright B$ , iff:

$\forall I \in \text{Den}(A), \exists I' \in \text{Den}(B) : I \text{ is more general than } I'$

□

We illustrate this moded more general relation with some small examples.

**Example 4.1.** *The binary tree program succeeds if the argument of the query represents a binary tree.*

```
bin(empty).
bin(tree(L,_,R)):- bin(L), bin(R).
```

The following moded more general relations hold w.r.t. the this program:

- $\text{bin}(X) \triangleright \text{bin}(\underline{I})$

*The denotation of  $\text{bin}(X)$  only contains the atom itself, which is more general than any atom in the denotation of  $\text{bin}(\underline{I})$ , e.g.  $\text{bin}(\text{empty})$ .*

- $\text{bin}(\text{tree}(\text{tree}(\underline{In}, V1, Xn), V2, Y)) \triangleright \text{bin}(\text{tree}(\underline{I}, V3, \text{tree}(X, V4, \text{empty})))$

*Every atom  $A$  of the denotation of  $\text{bin}(\text{tree}(\text{tree}(\underline{In}, V1, Xn), V2, Y))$ , is more general than some atom  $B$  denoted by  $\text{bin}(\text{tree}(\underline{I}, \text{tree}(X, \text{empty})))$ . For example,  $\text{bin}(\text{tree}(\text{tree}(\text{empty}, V1, Xn), V2, Y))$  (obtained by  $\{\underline{In} \setminus \text{empty}\}$ ) is more general than  $\text{bin}(\text{tree}(\text{tree}(\text{empty}, \text{empty}, \text{empty}), V3, \text{tree}(X, V4, \text{empty})))$  (obtained by  $\{\underline{I} \setminus \text{tree}(\text{empty}, \text{empty}, \text{empty})\}$ ). □*

Because the denotation of a moded atom is in general infinite, we cannot check this property for every atom in the denotation. However, there is a syntactic sufficient condition to check if the moded more general relation holds between two given moded atoms  $A$  and  $B$ . The condition is based on a particular kind of unifiability of the atoms.

We introduce the following notations. Let  $\text{InVar}_P$  be the set of input variables and  $\text{Var}_P$  the set of normal variables. To every  $\underline{I} \in \text{InVar}_P$  we associate a fresh normal variable  $I$ . Let  $\text{Term}_P^+$  denote the set of all terms constructible in the underlying language of  $P$  augmented with the variables  $\{I \mid \underline{I} \in \text{InVar}_P\}$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be two moded atoms. Let  $A_1$  and  $B_1$  be renamings of these atoms such that they have no shared variables. Let  $A_2$  and  $B_2$  denote variants of  $A_1$  and  $B_1$  in which every input variable  $\underline{I}$  is replaced by  $I$ . Let  $N_1^a, \dots, N_n^a$  be a subset of the normal variables in  $A_1$  and  $I_1^b, \dots, I_m^b$  be the fresh variables associated to the input variables in  $B_2$ .*

*If  $A_2$  and  $B_2$  are unifiable with a substitution  $\gamma = \{N_1^a \setminus t_1, \dots, N_n^a \setminus t_n, I_1^b \setminus t_1^+, \dots, I_m^b \setminus t_m^+\}$  with  $t_1, \dots, t_n \in \text{Term}_P$  and  $t_1^+, \dots, t_m^+ \in \text{Term}_P^+$ , then  $A$  is moded more general than  $B$ .* □

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha = \{N_1^a \setminus t_1, \dots, N_n^a \setminus t_n\}$  and  $\beta = \{I_1^b \setminus t_1^+, \dots, I_m^b \setminus t_m^+\}$ . Because  $I_1^b, \dots, I_m^b$  cannot occur in  $t_1, \dots, t_n$ ,  $\gamma = \beta \circ \alpha$ , and by unifiability,  $A_2\alpha\beta = B_2\alpha\beta$ . Moreover, since  $B_2$  does not contain  $N_1^a, \dots, N_n^a$ ,  $B_2\alpha\beta = B_2\beta$ , and since  $A_2\alpha$  does not contain  $I_1^b, \dots, I_m^b$ ,  $A_2\alpha\beta = A_2\alpha$ . Thus,  $A_2\alpha = B_2\beta$ .

Let  $A_c$  be an element of  $Den(A_1)$ . Then, there exists a substitution  $\psi = \{I_1^a \setminus s_1, \dots, I_k^a \setminus s_k\}$ , where  $I_1^a, \dots, I_k^a$  are all input variables of  $A_1$ ,  $s_1, \dots, s_k \in Term_P$  and  $s_1, \dots, s_k$  are ground, such that  $A_c = A_2\psi$ .

Now consider the atom  $B_c = B_2\beta\psi$ . First,  $B_c \in Den(B_1)$ . This is because  $\beta$  replaces all  $I_j^b$  of  $B_2$  by terms  $t_j^+$ . These terms  $t_j^+$  may contain variables  $I_l^a$  of  $A_2$ , but these are all substituted to ordinary ground terms  $s_l \in Term_P$  by  $\psi$ .

Finally, we have that  $A_c\alpha = A_2\psi\alpha = A_2\alpha\psi = B_2\beta\psi = B_c$ . Note that  $A_2\psi\alpha = A_2\alpha\psi$  because no  $s_i$  of  $\psi$  can contain a variable  $N_j^a$  of  $\alpha$ , nor can any  $t_i$  of  $\alpha$  contain a variable  $I_j^a$  of  $\psi$ . Thus  $A_c$  is more general than an element of  $Den(B_1)$ .  $\square$

We clarify this property by checking the moded more general relations of the last example.

**Example 4.2.** *The moded atoms of the last example are already variable disjunct. To check if the moded more general relation holds, we have to check if the atoms are unifiable with a substitution of the correct forms.*

- $bin(X) = bin(I)$  with substitution:  $\{I \setminus X\}$
- $bin(tree(tree(In, V1, Xn), V2, Y)) = bin(tree(I, V3, tree(X, V4, empty)))$   
with substitution:  $\{I \setminus tree(In, V1, Xn), V2 \setminus V3, Y \setminus tree(X, V4, empty)\}$

$\square$

## 4.1.2 Non-termination of moded more general loops

If a moded SLDNF-derivation contains a path without substitutions on input variables, such that the ancestor relation and the moded more general relation hold between the first and last selected literal in that path, we call this path a *moded more general loop*. We will show that a moded more general loop implies non-termination.

**Definition 4.3.** *In a moded SLDNF-derivation  $D$ , nodes  $N_i : G_i$  and  $N_j : G_j$  are a **moded more general loop**,  $N_i : G_i \xrightarrow{mmg} N_j : G_j$ , iff:*

- *No substitutions on input variables occur in the path from  $N_i$  to  $N_j$ .*

- $L_i^1 \prec_{anc} L_j^1$ .
- $L_j^1 \triangleright L_i^1$

□

Note that when no confusion can occur, we may omit writing the goal in the moded more general loop.

A moded more general loop,  $N_i : G_i \xrightarrow{mmg} N_j : G_j$ , corresponds to an infinite loop for every concrete goal in the denotation of  $G_i$ .

**Theorem 4.1** (Sufficiency of the moded more general loop). *Let  $N_i : G_i \xrightarrow{mmg} N_j : G_j$  be a moded more general loop in a moded SLDNF-derivation  $D$  of a program  $P$  and a moded query  $I$ . The sequence of clauses from  $N_i$  to  $N_j$ ,  $\langle C_1, \dots, C_n \rangle$ , can be repeated infinitely often for any goal in  $Den(G_i)$ .* □

*Proof.* Because  $L_i^1$  is an ancestor of  $L_j^1$ , the literals of  $N_i$  different from  $L_i^1$  are irrelevant for the derivation between  $N_i$  and  $N_j$  and hence for the repeatability.

Because no substitutions on input variables occur in the path from  $N_i$  down to  $N_j$ ,  $\langle C_1, \dots, C_n \rangle$  is applicable to any atom in the denotation of  $L_i^1$ . Obviously, this path is also applicable to any atom  $A$ , which is more general than some atom  $B$  in the denotation of  $L_i^1$ . Furthermore, after applying  $\langle C_1, \dots, C_n \rangle$  to  $A$ , the resulting selected literal is more general than the selected literal after applying  $\langle C_1, \dots, C_n \rangle$  to  $B$ .

As  $L_j^1 \triangleright L_i^1$ , any atom in  $Den(L_j^1)$  is more general than some atom in  $Den(L_i^1)$ .

Therefore, let  $S$  be the union of  $Den(L_i^1)$  and all more general atoms. Then,  $\langle C_1, \dots, C_n \rangle$  is applicable to any atom of  $S$ , and after applying these clauses, the selected literal of the resulting goal is again an atom of  $S$ . Thus, this sequence of clauses is infinitely often applicable to elements of  $S$ . □

We illustrate this non-termination condition with the *binary tree* program.

**Example 4.3** (Non-termination proof of *binary tree*). *Figure 4.1 shows the moded SLD-tree of  $bin(X)$  using LP-check with repetition number 2.*

*The path from  $N_0$  to  $N_2$  satisfies the conditions of Definition 4.3:*

- *There are no substitutions on input variables from  $N_0$  to  $N_2$ .*
- *The selected atom of  $N_0$  is an ancestor of the selected atom at  $N_2$ .*
- $bin(L) \triangleright bin(X)$




Figure 4.1: Moded SLD-tree for the *binary tree* program, using *LP – check* with repetition number 2

so  $N_0 \xrightarrow{mmg} N_2$  is a moded more general loop. Therefore, non-termination of this example is proven by Theorem 4.1.  $\square$

Observe that Theorem 4.1 can straightforwardly be generalized to conclude non-termination for any goal that is more general than an element of  $Den(G_i)$ . In particular, the analysis is not restricted to goals with ground inputs: Theorem 4.1 also holds for an "extended" denotation of  $G_i$ , with non-ground inputs. However, if the denotation is extended so that an input variable can be replaced by a non-ground term, we have to be careful not to introduce aliased variables on the input positions.

**Example 4.4** (Aliasing).  $p(f(X), Y) :- p(X, f(Y))$ .

When applying the above clause to a moded goal  $p(X, \underline{I})$ , the result is  $p(X', f(\underline{I}))$ . These atoms satisfy the moded more general relation. However, if we replace the input variable  $I$  with the aliased variable  $X$  in the original goal, the result is  $p(X', f(f(X')))$ , which is not more general than any atom in the denotation of  $p(X', f(\underline{I}))$ .  $\square$

### 4.1.3 Input-generalizations

Our experimental evaluation (see Section 4.2) shows that for many non-terminating programs, non-termination can be proven using the moded more general loop. But, the next example shows that there is room for further improvement.



**Example 4.5** (Termination behavior of *flat*).

```
flat(niltree, nil).
flat(tree(X, niltree, XS), cons(X, YS)) :- flat(XS, YS).
flat(tree(X, tree(Y, YS1, YS2), XS), ZS) :-
    flat(tree(Y, YS1, tree(X, YS2, XS)), ZS).
```

This program, *flat*, flattens a binary tree into a list denoted with the *cons* notation. To flatten the tree, the program repeatedly moves one element from the left to the right subtree until the left subtree is empty. When the left subtree is empty, we proceed by processing the right subtree. If the first argument of the query is a variable, this program loops w.r.t. the third clause.




Figure 4.2: Moded generalized SLDNF-tree with LP-check of *flat* (Example 4.5)

Figure 4.2 shows a part of the moded generalized SLDNF-tree constructed for moded query *flat*(*T*, *I*) using LP-check with repetition number 3. No nodes in the derivations satisfy Definition 4.3. Indeed, in deriving  $N_2$  and  $N_4$  substitutions on input variables are applied. Furthermore,  $N_6$  is not moded more general than  $N_4$  and  $N_8$  is not moded more general than  $N_6$  because the derivation steps replace a variable by a compound term.  $\square$

To prove non-termination for programs such as *flat*, we define an *input-generalization*. This input-generalization is such that proving non-termination of an input-generalized goal implies non-termination of the original goal.

**Definition 4.4.** We say that  $A^\alpha$  is an *input-generalization* of an atom  $A$ , if there exist terms  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  in  $A$  and fresh input variables  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  such that  $A^\alpha = A(\underline{I}_1 \rightarrow t_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n \rightarrow t_n)$  and  $\text{Var}(A^\alpha) \cap \text{Var}((t_1, \dots, t_n)) = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

**Example 4.6** (Input generalizations).

- $\text{bin}(\text{tree}(\underline{I}, \underline{I}_1))$  is an input-generalization of  $\text{bin}(\text{tree}(\underline{I}, \text{tree}(X, \text{empty})))$
- $\text{bin}(\underline{I}_2)$  is an input-generalization of  $\text{bin}(\text{tree}(\underline{I}, \underline{I}_1))$
- $\text{bin}(\text{tree}(\underline{I}_3, X))$  is not an input generalization of  $\text{bin}(\text{tree}(\text{tree}(X, Y), X))$   
This last example refers to the condition of the empty intersection of the variable sets. We return to this condition in Example 4.7.  $\square$

To check if a path is non-terminating w.r.t. an input-generalized goal, we define an *input-generalized derivation*. This derivation is constructed by applying a path in a given derivation to the input-generalized selected literal of the first node in the path.

**Definition 4.5.** Let  $D$  be a *moded SLDNF-derivation*  $N_i, \dots, N_j$ , such that  $L_i^1 \prec_{\text{anc}} L_j^1$ . Let  $\langle C_1, \dots, C_n \rangle$  be the sequence of clauses applied from  $N_i$  to  $N_j$  and let  $A^\alpha$  be an input-generalization of  $L_i^1$ .

The **input-generalized derivation**  $D'$  for  $A^\alpha$ , is constructed by applying the sequence of clauses  $\langle C_1, \dots, C_n \rangle$  to  $A^\alpha$ . The **input-generalized nodes**  $N_i^\alpha$  and  $N_j^\alpha$  are the top and bottom nodes of  $D'$ , respectively.  $\square$

Next, we prove that non-termination of the input-generalized derivation implies non-termination of the original goal. First we introduce two lemmas.

**Lemma 4.1.** Let  $A^\alpha$  be an input generalization of  $A$ , then  $A \triangleright A^\alpha$ .  $\square$

*Proof.* Let  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  be the input variables of  $A$  and  $\underline{I}_{n+1}, \dots, \underline{I}_m$  be the new introduced input variables in  $A^\alpha$ . For every concrete atom  $A_c$  in  $\text{Den}(A)$ ,  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  are replaced by ground terms. To construct an atom  $A_c^\alpha$  of  $\text{Den}(A^\alpha)$ , for which  $A_c$  is more general than  $A_c^\alpha$ , one replaces  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  by the same values as in  $A_c$  and  $\underline{I}_{n+1}, \dots, \underline{I}_m$  by instances of the corresponding terms,  $t_{n+1}, \dots, t_m$ , in  $A_c$ . Due to the condition that  $\text{Var}(A^\alpha) \cap \text{Var}((t_{n+1}, \dots, t_m)) = \emptyset$ ,  $A_c$  is more general than  $A_c^\alpha$ .  $\square$

**Example 4.7.** To explain the condition on the intersection of the variables in Definition 4.4, consider the atom  $A = a(X, f(X))$ . If we omit the condition on the variables, we could consider  $A^\alpha = a(X, \underline{I})$  as an input generalization.  $\text{Den}(A) = \{a(X, f(X))\}$  and  $a(X, f(X))$  is not more general than any element in  $\text{Den}(a(X, \underline{I}))$ . So, the property that  $A \triangleright A^\alpha$  would not hold.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be atoms such that  $A \triangleright B$  and let every atom in  $\text{Den}(B)$  be non-terminating w.r.t. a program  $P$ , then, every atom in  $\text{Den}(A)$  is non-terminating w.r.t.  $P$ .*  $\square$

*Proof.* Every atom of  $\text{Den}(A)$  is more general than a non-terminating atom.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.1** (Non-termination with input-generalization). *Let  $N_i : G_i$  and  $N_j : G_j$  be nodes in a derivation  $D$  of a program  $P$  for a moded query  $I$ , such that  $L_i^1 \prec_{\text{anc}} L_j^1$ , and let  $N_i^\alpha$  and  $N_j^\alpha$  be input-generalized nodes in an input-generalized derivation  $D'$  of  $N_i$  and  $N_j$  for  $A$ .*

*If  $N_i^\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{mmg}} N_j^\alpha$ , then every concrete goal in the denotation of  $G_i$  is non-terminating w.r.t. program  $P$ .*

*Proof.* Follows from Theorem 4.1 and the two previous lemmas.  $\square$

We illustrate these input-generalizations by revisiting the *flat* example.

**Example 4.8** (Non-termination of *flat*). *To prove non-termination, we generalize node  $N_6$  to  $\text{flat}(\text{tree}(Y, Yl, \underline{In}), \underline{I2})$ , by changing the subterm  $\text{tree}(X, Yr, Xr)$  to a new input variable  $\underline{In}$ .*




Figure 4.3: Input-generalized SLDNF-derivation of *flat*

Figure 4.3, shows the input-generalized moded SLDNF-derivation for  $\text{flat}(\text{tree}(Y, Yl, \underline{In}), \underline{I2})$ . This derivation is a moded more general loop:  $N_6^\alpha \xrightarrow{\text{mmg}} N_8^\alpha$ . Therefore, non-termination of the program *flat* w.r.t. the concrete goals in the denotation of the goal of  $N_6$  is proven by Corollary 4.1.

Obviously, not every query in the denotation of  $\text{flat}(T, \underline{I})$  reaches node  $N_6$ . However, when we apply all substitutions on input variables between nodes  $N_0$  and  $N_6$ , we obtain a class of non-terminating top level queries. In this case  $\text{flat}(T, \text{cons}(\underline{U}, \text{cons}(\underline{X}, \underline{I2})))$ . To construct a class of non-terminating queries that reaches this node and therefore loops, it is enough to apply all substitutions on input variables occurring between  $N_0$  and  $N_6$ .  $\square$

Note that a concrete query in the denotation of a moded query might not reach the moded more general loop. However, classes of non-terminating top level

queries can be obtained by applying all substitutions on the input variables between the root and the first node of the moded more general loop. In the last example, this class of top level queries is  $flat(T, cons(\underline{U}, cons(\underline{X}, \underline{I2})))$ .

## 4.2 Experimental evaluation

To evaluate our approach, we implemented a non-termination analyzer *P2P*, from *Prediction to Proof*, based on Corollary 4.1. We tested *P2P* on a benchmark of 48 non-terminating pure logic programs. First, we describe our analyzer and the benchmark. Then, we compare our tool with the non-termination inference tool *NTI* [38].

### 4.2.1 *P2P*: from *Prediction to Proof*

We implemented *P2P* in SWI-prolog [59]. *P2P* consists of two components. First, the implementation of the termination prediction approach from the previous chapter, *TPoLP*, constructs the moded SLDNF-derivation and predicts the termination behavior. If *TPoLP* predicts a derivation to be non-terminating, the second component tries to prove non-termination in the derivation.

To prove non-termination, *P2P* checks if the derivation contains a moded more general loop or it uses a backtracking search to attempt to construct an input generalized derivation that contains a moded more general loop. Although many input generalizations can be constructed, proving non-termination in a derivation can be done rather efficiently. This is because the LP-cuts made by *TPoLP* correctly identify an infinite loop if the repetition number is sufficiently high. Therefore, instead of checking the conditions of the moded more general loop between all pairs of nodes in the derivation, it suffices to check these conditions for the pairs of nodes of the LP-cut.

### 4.2.2 Benchmark of Termination Problems

Our benchmark consists of the non-terminating pure logic programs from the termination competition of 2007. The benchmark and the results from the tools that participated in the competition are available online [1]. The benchmark of the termination competition contains around 300 logic programs and moded queries representing different challenges in termination and non-termination analysis. A few programs from the competition are omitted because they contain non-logical operations such as arithmetics. The competition benchmark

contains some doubles. These were also omitted. The benchmark contains 48 non-terminating programs. All programs contain between 2 and 15 clauses, except for `binary4`, which contains 41 clauses. Note that the benchmark contains some complex programs, e.g. `pl5.2.2` which is a Turing machine simulator. The only other non-termination analyzer, *NTI* [38], proves non-termination for 45 benchmark programs.

| Name program      | <i>P2P</i> | Size | Time | <i>NTI</i> | Name program   | <i>P2P</i> | Size | Time | <i>NTI</i> |
|-------------------|------------|------|------|------------|----------------|------------|------|------|------------|
| ackermann-ioi     | V          | 9    | 0.33 | V          | permutation-fb | V          | 22   | 0.26 | V          |
| bad sublist       | V          | 33   | 0.29 | V          | pl1.1          | V          | 8    | 0.25 | V          |
| binary4           | V          | 12   | 0.27 | V          | pl3.1.1        | V          | 12   | 0.30 | V          |
| delete-bff        | V          | 13   | 0.31 | V          | pl3.5.6        | V          | 13   | 0.31 | V          |
| der-fb            | V          | 22   | 0.29 | V          | pl4.0.1-oooi   | V          | 33   | 0.27 | V          |
| doublehalfpred    | V          | 38   | 0.28 | V          | pl4.5.2        | V          | 481  | 0.36 | V          |
| example4-2        | V          | 4    | 0.23 | V          | pl4.5.3a       | V          | 10   | 0.29 | V          |
| flatlength-fbf    | V          | 14   | 0.23 | V          | pl4.5.3b       | V          | 10   | 0.24 | V          |
| flatlength-ffb    | V          | 19   | 0.23 | V          | pl4.5.3c       | V          | 11   | 0.27 | V          |
| flat-oi           | V          | 9    | 0.26 | X          | pl5.2.2        | V          | 59   | 0.27 | V          |
| frontier-fb       | V          | 12   | 0.27 | V          | pl7.6.2.a      | V          | 39   | 0.27 | X          |
| ifdiv             | V          | 19   | 0.29 | V          | pl7.6.2.b      | V          | 45   | 0.33 | X          |
| in-bf             | V          | 18   | 0.29 | V          | quicksort-fb   | V          | 72   | 0.26 | V          |
| inorder-fb        | V          | 4    | 0.27 | V          | quicksort-oi   | V          | 74   | 0.26 | V          |
| insert-bff        | V          | 22   | 0.29 | V          | reverse-fb     | V          | 9    | 0.32 | V          |
| log2a-oi          | V          | 35   | 0.25 | V          | select-bff     | V          | 8    | 0.32 | V          |
| log2b-oi          | V          | 29   | 0.28 | V          | slowsort-fb    | V          | 123  | 0.27 | V          |
| mapcolor          | V          | 23   | 0.31 | V          | slowsort-oi    | V          | 26   | 0.26 | V          |
| member-bf         | V          | 8    | 0.27 | V          | sublist-bf     | V          | 30   | 0.21 | V          |
| mergesort         | V          | 171  | 0.28 | V          | subset-bf      | V          | 21   | 0.23 | V          |
| mergesort-oi      | V          | 54   | 0.28 | V          | subset-fb      | V          | 14   | 0.26 | V          |
| mergesort_variant | V          | 15   | 0.23 | V          | suffix-bf      | V          | 9    | 0.25 | V          |
| minimum-fb        | V          | 8    | 0.29 | V          | transpose2     | V          | 6    | 0.28 | V          |
| naive reverse-fb  | V          | 8    | 0.37 | V          | tree_member-bf | V          | 12   | 0.28 | V          |

Table 4.1: Benchmark of non-terminating pure logic programs.

Table 1 shows our experimental evaluation on this benchmark using LP-check with pruning, with 4 as a repetition number. The result of our tool is given in the column *P2P*, *V* denotes that non-termination is proven while *X* denotes that no non-termination proof was found. The result of *NTI* is given in the column *NTI*. The columns *Size* and *Time* show the size in the number of nodes of the SLDNF-tree and the analysis time in seconds, respectively.

The results are very satisfactory. For all programs in the benchmark, non-termination is proven and a class of non-terminating queries can be constructed. The analyzer is very fast. Any benchmark program is analyzed in less than a second and the memory use never exceeds a few megabytes.

As stated, these experiments have been performed using 4 as a repetition number. When we use 3 as a repetition number, our tool fails to prove non-termination of programs `pl7.6.2.a` and `pl7.6.2.b`. These are two erroneous implementations of a path find algorithm. When using 2 as repetition number, proving non-

termination fails for about 25% of the benchmark programs. This is no surprise, since the loss of precision using 2 as a repetition number, was also encountered in the experimental evaluation of *TPoLP*.

### 4.2.3 Comparison with *NTI*

To infer non-terminating queries, *NTI* first transforms a given program into a binary program using *binary unfoldings*. Then, it compares the head and body of the clauses in the binary program with a special more general relation. If this relation holds, non-termination is proven.

The binary unfolding of a program represent the calls made during program execution. Thus, it corresponds to comparing the selected literals in our symbolic computation. The binary unfolding of a program can be computed using a fixpoint operator.

The special more general relation used by *NTI*,  $\Delta$ -*more general*, is based on the notion of *derivation neutral (DN) filters*. These filters are functions defining, for a clause and argument position, which terms have no influence on the applicability of the clause. Furthermore, if the head atom satisfies the filter, the body atom must satisfy the filter as well. We explain *NTI*'s non-termination condition and compare it with our approach using some small examples.

**Example 4.9** (Recursive clause of reverse-fb).

```
rev([H|T], Temp, Res) :- rev(T, [H|Temp], Res).
```

*In this clause, the second argument is not replaced by a more general one. Therefore, NTI needs a DN filter to prove non-termination. The applicability of the clause does not depend on the value of Temp, so we can use the trivial filter, instance of X, for the second argument position. We can also use this filter for the last argument position. Therefore, NTI concludes that this clause is non-terminating for each goal where the first argument is more general than [H|T] and the second and third argument are instances of X.*  $\square$

These DN filters cannot depend on the names of the variables. Therefore, they cannot express that two argument must contain a common subterm.

**Example 4.10** (Variable independent filters).  $a(X, X) :- a(s(X), s(X)).$

*Both arguments are replaced by more specific ones and the applicability does not depend on the value of X. However, since both arguments must be bound to the same term, NTI fails to prove non-termination of this example.*  $\square$

Instead of comparing all the arguments independently, our approach compares the selected literals. Therefore, our condition does not have this restriction.

Because *NTI* requires that each argument is either replaced by a more general one or satisfies a DN filter, *NTI* fails to prove non-termination if in one argument, a subterm is replaced by a more general one while another subterm is replaced by a more specific one. This is because of the requirement that if the head atom satisfies the filter, the body atom needs to satisfy it as well.

**Example 4.11** (Looping clause of *flat-oi*). *In the third clause of flat-oi in Example 4.8, the first argument of this clause contains two such subterms.  $XS$  is replaced by  $\text{tree}(X, \text{YS2}, XS)$  and  $\text{tree}(Y, \text{YS1}, \text{YS2})$  is replaced by  $\text{YS1}$ .  $\square$*

Because we allow arguments to contain both input and ordinary variables, our condition does not have this restriction.

Table 1 shows that *NTI* fails to prove non-termination of 3 programs. These 3 programs are examples of the two classes of problems that are illustrated by Examples 4.10 and 4.11. The actual results on the termination competition were worse for *NTI*, as we have rewritten some programs that *NTI* could not parse.

## 4.3 Summary

We introduced a new approach to non-termination analysis of logic programs based on a finite, symbolic derivation tree for a moded query. This symbolic tree represents the derivation trees of all concrete queries denoted by the moded query. To prove non-termination we look for a loop in this symbolic derivation tree. We implemented this approach and evaluated it on a benchmark of 48 non-terminating programs from the termination competition of 2007. Our tool, *P2P*, proves non-termination of all benchmark programs. We have shown that our technique improves on the results of the only non-termination analyzer developed before our work, *NTI*, and that we can handle 2 new classes of programs.

## Reference

The work in this chapter was presented at ICLP 2009 and is published in [58].





## Chapter 5

# Non-termination Analysis for Logic Programs using Types

In this chapter, we identify two classes of programs for which previous non-termination analyzers fail and we extend our non-termination analysis to handle such programs.

A first limitation of both *NTI* and *P2P* is that they only detect non-terminating derivations if, within these derivations, some fixed sequence of clauses can be applied repeatedly.

**Example 5.1.** *The program, longer, loops for any query longer(L), with L a non-empty list of zeros.*

```
longer([0|L]):-  
    zeros(L),  
    longer([0,0|L]).  
zeros([]).  
zeros([0|L]):- zeros(L).
```

*The list in the recursive call is longer than the original one and thus, the number of applications of the recursive clause for zeros/1 increases in each recursion. Therefore, no fixed sequence of clauses can be repeated infinitely and previous non-termination analyzers fail to prove non-termination of this example.  $\square$*

Example 5.1, which was also discussed in the introduction, shows a program that violates this restriction. We overcome this limitation by using non-failure

information. *Non-failure analysis* [17] detects classes of goals that can be guaranteed not to fail, given mode and type information. Its applications include inferring minimal computational costs, guiding transformations and debugging. To use the information provided by non-failure analysis in the non-termination analysis of [58], type information must be added to the symbolic derivation tree. We add this information using regular types [60]. Non-failure information allows to abstract away from the details on how success was reached for these computations. For the *longer* program, non-failure analysis proves that *zeros/1* cannot fail for the inferred types. This will allow us to prove non-termination for the *longer* program.

### Example 5.2.

```
append([], L, L).
append([H|T], L, [H|R]) :- append(T, L, R).
```

*The query `append(X, X, X)` succeeds once with a computed answer substitution  $X/[]$ . The program loops after backtracking. NTI needs a filter for the second argument to prove non-termination of this example. However, these filters are only allowed on argument positions that don't share variables with terms on other positions. Because all argument positions contain the same variable, NTI fails to prove non-termination of this example.*

*Similarly, P2P needs an input-generalization to prove non-termination for this example. Due to the shared variables, this input-generalization is not allowed for this query.*  $\square$

Another limitation of previous non-termination analyzers is related to aliased variables. Non-termination analyzers developed before 2011 fail to prove non-termination of programs such as the one in Example 5.2. We will show that program specialization can be used to overcome this limitation. In addition to these two classes of programs, there are combinations of them that yield a fairly large class of new programs that we can prove non-terminating using non-failure analysis combined with program specialization.

Note that from here on in the thesis, we will focus on definite logic programs. The extension to general logic programs should be fairly easy, but we see little advantages in practice. Therefore, we will only consider definite logic programs in the rest of the thesis.

The chapter is organized as follows. Section 5.1 introduces preliminaries. Section 5.2 extends the moded SLD-tree with types and introduces a special derivation step to handle non-failing goals. Section 5.3 adapts our non-termination condition for this setting and illustrates that Program Specialization can be

used to further improve the power of our non-termination analyzer. Finally, Section 5.4 summarizes the chapter.

## 5.1 Preliminaries

### 5.1.1 Types

In this chapter, we extend the moded SLD-tree defined in the previous chapter by adding a special operation for nodes with a non-failing selected atom. To use non-failure information, type information of the partially instantiated goals must be available. Since logic programs are untyped, this type information will be inferred. Many techniques and tools exist to infer type definitions for a given logic program, for example [12]. We will describe types using *regular types* as defined in [60]. The set of type symbols is denoted by  $\Sigma_\tau$ .

**Definition 5.1.** *Let  $P$  be a logic program. A **type rule** for a type symbol  $T \in \Sigma_\tau$  is of the form  $T \rightarrow c_1; \dots; c_i; f_{i+1}(\bar{\tau}_{i+1}); \dots; f_k(\bar{\tau}_k)$ , ( $k \geq 1$ ), where  $c_1, \dots, c_i$  are constants,  $f_{i+1}, \dots, f_k$  are distinct function symbols associated with  $T$  and  $\bar{\tau}_j$  ( $i+1 \leq j \leq k$ ) are tuples of corresponding type symbols of  $\Sigma_\tau$ . A **type definition**  $\mathcal{T}$  is a finite set of type rules, where no two rules contain the same type symbol on the left hand side, and for each type symbol occurring in the type definition, there is a type rule defining it.  $\square$*

A *predicate signature* declares one type symbol for each argument position of a given predicate. A *well-typing*  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{S} \rangle$  of a program  $P$ , is a pair consisting of a type definition  $\mathcal{T}$  and a set  $\mathcal{S}$  containing one predicate signature for each predicate of  $P$ , such that the types of the actual parameters passed to a predicate are an instance of the predicate's signature. For this chapter, we use *PolyTypes* ([12]) to infer signatures and type definitions. In [12], it has been proven that these inferred signatures and type definitions are a well-typing for the given program.

Types allow to give a more precise description of the possible values during evaluation at different argument positions. The set of terms constructible from a certain type definition, is called the *denotation of the type*. We represent the denotation of type  $T$  by  $Den(T)$ .

Given a type definition  $\mathcal{T}$ , for every type  $T$  defined by  $\mathcal{T}$ , we introduce an infinite set of fresh variables  $Var_T$ . For any two types  $T_1 \neq T_2$ , we impose that  $Var_{T_1} \cap Var_{T_2} = \emptyset$ .

**Definition 5.2.** Let  $T_1, \dots, T_n$  be types defined by a type definition  $\mathcal{T}$  defining type symbols  $\bar{\tau}$ . The **denotation**  $Den(T_i)$  of  $T_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ), defined by  $T_i \rightarrow c_1; \dots; c_j; f_{j+1}(\bar{\tau}_{j+1}); \dots; f_k(\bar{\tau}_k)$ , is recursively defined as:

- every variable in  $Var_{T_i}$  is an element of  $Den(T_i)$
- every constant  $c_p, 1 \leq p \leq j$ , is an element of  $Den(T_i)$
- for every type term  $f_p(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_l), j < p \leq k, :$  if  $t_1 \in Den(\tau_1), \dots, t_l \in Den(\tau_l)$ , then  $f_i(t_1, \dots, t_l) \in Den(T_i)$   $\square$

**Example 5.3.** For the program *longer* of Example 5.1, the following types and signatures are inferred by *PolyTypes*:

$$\begin{array}{ll} T_{lz} \rightarrow [ ]; [T_0 \mid T_{lz}] & longer(T_{lz}) \\ T_0 \rightarrow 0 & zeros(T_{lz}) \end{array}$$

$Den(T_0)$  is the set containing 0 and all variables of  $Var_{T_0}$ .  $Den(T_{lz})$  contains:  $[ ], Y, [0, 0], [0, X, 0], [X|Y], \dots$ , with  $X \in Var_{T_0}$  and  $Y \in Var_{T_{lz}}$ .  $\square$

### 5.1.2 Non-failure analysis and program specialization

Given type and mode information, *non-failure analysis* detects goals that can be guaranteed not to fail, i.e. they either succeed or go in an infinite loop. We use the non-failure analysis technique of [17] in our non-termination analysis.

**Example 5.4.** For Example 5.1, *non-failure analysis* proves that *zeros/1* is non-failing if its argument is an input mode of type  $T_{lz}$ . It cannot show that *longer/1* with an argument of type  $T_{lz}$  is non-failing, because *longer*( $[ ]$ ) fails.  $\square$

Program specialization aims at transforming a given logic program into an equivalent but more efficient program for a certain query. This query can be partially instantiated, yielding a specialized program for a class of queries. Program specialization has received a lot of attention in the community, see for example [26]. In this chapter, we use the specialization tool *ECCE*, [26], to generate specialized programs.

## 5.2 Moded-Typed SLD-trees and the $NFG$ transition

### 5.2.1 Moded-typed SLD-trees and loop checking

As stated in the introduction, we want to prove non-termination of partially instantiated queries, given mode and type information of the variables in the query. In such a partially instantiated query, variables representing unknown terms are labeled *input modes*. To every input mode, a type is assigned. An atom  $Q$  is a *moded-typed* atom if some variables of  $Q$  are input modes, otherwise, it is a *concrete* atom. The terms represented by input modes in an atom  $Q$  are restricted to terms of their respective type. Note that the user does not have to declare the types associated to input modes, because the inferred well-typing declares a unique type for every subterm of atoms defined by the program.

**Definition 5.3.** Let  $P$  be a program,  $Q = p(\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_m, T_1, \dots, T_n)$  a moded-typed atom and  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{S} \rangle$  a well-typing for  $P$ . The **moded-typed SLD-tree** of  $P$  for  $Q$ , is a pair  $(GT_{G_0}, \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{S} \rangle)$ , where  $GT_{G_0}$  is the generalized SLD-tree for  $P \cup \{\leftarrow p(\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_m, T_1, \dots, T_n)\}$ , with each  $\underline{I}_i$  being a special variable not occurring in any  $T_j$ . The special variables  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_m$  are called **input variables**.  $\square$

As mentioned, an input variable  $\underline{I}$  may be substituted by a term  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ . If  $\underline{I}$  is substituted by  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ , all variables in  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  also become input variables. In particular, when unifying  $\underline{I}$  with a normal variable  $X$ ,  $X$  becomes an input variable. We refer to Figure 5.1 for an illustration of (part of) a moded-typed SLD-tree.

A moded-typed atom  $A$  represents a set of concrete atoms, called the *denotation* of  $A$ . This is the set of atoms obtained by replacing the input modes by arbitrary terms of their respective type.

**Definition 5.4.** Let  $A$  be a moded-typed atom with  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  as its input variables with types  $T_1, \dots, T_n$ , respectively. The **denotation** of  $A$ ,  $Den(A)$ , is

$$\{A(t_1 \rightarrow \underline{I}_1, \dots, t_n \rightarrow \underline{I}_n) \mid t_1 \in Den(T_1), \dots, t_n \in Den(T_n)\} \quad \square$$

Note that non-termination of an atom implies non-termination of all more general atoms. Therefore, we consider a moded-typed atom  $A$  to represent all atoms of the denotation of  $A$ , as well as all more general atoms. We call this set the *extended denotation* of  $A$ .

**Definition 5.5.** Let  $A$  be a moded-typed atom with  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  as its input variables with types  $T_1, \dots, T_n$ , respectively. The **extended denotation** of  $A$ ,  $Ext(A)$ , is

$$\{I \mid I' \in Den(A), I \text{ is more general than } I'\} \quad \square$$

Note that this extended denotation includes the atoms of the denotation and that this concept can be adapted to moded-typed goals in a straightforward way.

Moded-typed SLD-trees represent all derivations for a certain class of queries. For most programs and classes of queries, this tree is infinite. In order to obtain a finite tree, we can use a complete loop check, to cut all infinite derivations from the tree.

**Example 5.5.** Figure 5.1 shows the moded-typed SLD-tree for *longer*, using *LP-check* with repetition number 2.




Figure 5.1: Moded-typed SLD-tree for the atom *longer*, using *LP-check* with repetition number 2

At node  $N_5$ , *LP-check* cuts clause 1 because node  $N_5$  is a loop goal of node  $N_2$ . Likewise, *LP-check* cuts clause 3 at node  $N_6$  and clause 1 at node  $N_{11}$ .  $\square$

## 5.2.2 The $NFG$ transition

As illustrated in Example 5.1, one of the main limitations of current non-termination analysis techniques is that non-termination can only be proven for programs and queries repeating a fixed sequence of clauses. To overcome this limitation, we extend the moded-typed SLD-tree of Definition 5.3 by adding a special transition  $NFG$ , to treat non-failing selected atoms. This transition allows to abstract from the sequence of clauses needed to solve the non-failing atom. Note that during the evaluation of a non-failing atom, normal variables may be bound to terms of their respective type. Therefore, we approximate the application of this unknown sequence of clauses by substituting all normal variables in the selected atom by fresh input variables of the correct type. In the next subsection, the correlation between these resulting moded-typed SLD-trees and concrete SLD-trees is given.

**Definition 5.6.** Let  $N_i : \leftarrow A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$  be a node in a moded-typed SLD-tree, with  $A_1$  a non-failing atom. Let  $V_1, \dots, V_m$  be all normal variables of  $A_1$ , corresponding to types  $T_1, \dots, T_m$ , respectively. Let  $\underline{V}_1, \dots, \underline{V}_m$  be new input variables of types  $T_1, \dots, T_m$ , respectively. Then, an  $NFG$  transition,  $N_i : \leftarrow A_1, \dots, A_n \Rightarrow_{NFG} N_{i+1} : \leftarrow A_2\theta, \dots, A_n\theta$ , can be applied to  $N_i$ , with substitution  $\theta = \{V_1 \setminus \underline{V}_1, \dots, V_m \setminus \underline{V}_m\}$ .  $\square$

Note that we can also allow an  $NFG$  transition to be applied to a goal containing only one atom, resulting in a refutation.

**Definition 5.7.** Let  $P$  be a logic program,  $Q$  a moded-typed atom and  $\langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{S} \rangle$  a well-typing for  $P$ . The **moded-typed SLD-tree with  $NFG$**  is the pair  $(GT_{(NFG, G_0)}, \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{S} \rangle)$ , where  $GT_{(NFG, G_0)}$  is obtained from the generalized SLD-tree  $GT_{G_0}$  for  $P \cup \leftarrow Q$ , by, at each node:  $N_i : \leftarrow A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$ , with  $A_1$  a non-failing atom, additionally applying the  $NFG$  transition.  $\square$

Without proof, we state that  $LP - check$  is also a complete loop check for moded-typed SLD-trees with  $NFG$ . From here on, when we refer to a moded-typed SLD-tree, we mean the finite part of a moded-typed SLD-tree with  $NFG$ , obtained by using  $LP - check$  with some repetition number,  $r$ .

**Example 5.6.** Figure 5.2 shows the moded-typed SLD-tree of Example 5.1 for the query  $longer(\underline{L})$  using 3 as a repetition number. The selected atom at node  $N_1$ ,  $zeros(\underline{M})$ , is non-failing and can be solved using an  $NFG$  transition. Since there are no normal variables in the selected atom, there are no substitutions for this transition. At node  $N_3$ , the  $NFG$  transition is applied as well.

At node  $N_4$ ,  $LP - check$  cuts the derivation because of the chain of loop goals  $N_0 \Rightarrow_1 \dots N_2 \Rightarrow_1 \dots N_4 \Rightarrow_1$ .  $\square$



Figure 5.2: Moded-typed SLD-tree with *NFG* transitions of the *longer* program

Figure 5.3: Moded-typed SLD-tree of Example 5.8

### 5.2.3 Correlation with concrete queries

The correlation between derivations in moded-typed SLD-trees without *NFG* transitions and concrete SLD-derivations is rather simple. For every derivation in such a moded-typed SLD-tree from  $N_0 : G_0$  to  $N_i : G_i$ , there exists a non-empty subset of the concrete goals of the extended denotation of  $G_0$  on which the same sequence of clauses can be applied. This subset of goals can be obtained from  $G_0$  by applying the composition of all substitutions on input variables from  $N_0$  to  $N_i$ .

**Example 5.7.** In the derivation from  $N_0$  to  $N_8$  in Figure 5.1, there are three substitutions on input variables:  $\underline{L} \setminus [0|\underline{M}]$ ,  $\underline{M} \setminus [0|\underline{N}]$  and  $\underline{N} \setminus []$ . Applying these substitutions to the query  $\text{longer}(\underline{L})$  gives the concrete query  $\text{longer}([0,0])$ .  $\square$

For typed SLD-trees with *NFG* transitions, there is no such clear correspondence. Solving a non-failing atom corresponds to a potentially infinite sequence of clause applications. Thus, for an *NFG* transition  $N_i : G_i \rightarrow_{NFG} N_j : G_j$ , it is possible that no concrete state corresponding to  $G_j$  ever occurs in a concrete derivation. However, this will not cause any problems for our analysis. If our analysis detects and reports a non-terminating computation for a branch in the moded-typed SLD-tree which has an *NFG* transition, then a corresponding concrete atom either finitely succeeds or non-terminates. In both cases, reporting non-termination is correct.

There is a second problem with the correspondence between *NFG* transitions and concrete derivations. Input variables introduced by *NFG* give an



overestimation of the possible values after evaluating the non-failing selected atom in a concrete derivation. Therefore, substitutions on such input variables further down the tree might be impossible and thus, cannot be allowed. We illustrate this with an example.

**Example 5.8.**

```
start:- a(L), loop(L).
a([0]).
a([0,0]).
loop([0,0,0]):- loop([0,0,0]).
```

$T_{lz}$  is a correct type definition for all arguments of atoms. Non-failure analysis ([17]) shows that  $a(L)$  is non-failing if  $L$  is a free variable.

Figure 5.3 shows a part of the moded-typed SLD-tree using repetition number 2 for the query **start**. At node  $N_1$ , the non-failing atom  $a(L)$  is solved by replacing the variable  $L$  by a new input variable  $\underline{I}$ . The path from  $N_3$  to  $N_4$  is a loop. However, this loop cannot be reached because  $\underline{I}$  is substituted by  $[0,0,0]$ , but the program only allows it to be  $[0]$  or  $[0,0]$ .  $\square$

We introduce the following proposition showing the correlation between moded-typed SLD-trees and concrete SLD-trees.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $T$  be a moded-typed SLD-tree with  $NFG$  for a goal  $G_0$  and  $N_i$  a node of  $T$ . Let  $\theta$  be the composition of all substitutions on input variables from  $N_0$  to  $N_i$ .*

*If the derivation from  $N_0$  to  $N_i$  does not contain a substitution on input variables introduced by  $NFG$  transitions, then all goals in  $Ext(G_0\theta)$  can be evaluated to goals in  $Ext(G_i)$  or loop w.r.t. an  $NFG$  transition.*  $\square$

*Proof.* By induction on the length of the derivation.

**Base case.** Since we assume the query to consist only of one atom, applying an  $NFG$  transition to the top level goal  $G_0$  results in a refutation. Since  $G_0$  is non-failing, every element of  $Ext(G_0)$  either results in a refutation or loops w.r.t. this  $NFG$  transition. Applying a clause,  $N_0 : G_0 \Rightarrow_C N_1 : G_1$ , to  $G_0$  only succeeds if the actual values of the input variables are such that the substitutions on the corresponding terms succeed. Therefore, let  $\sigma_T$  be the substitutions on input variables corresponding to this derivation step, then clause  $C$  is applicable to  $Ext(G_0\sigma_T)$ .

**Induction step for NFG application** Assume the lemma holds for  $N_0 : G_0 \Rightarrow N_i : G_i$  and that we apply  $N_i : G_i \Rightarrow_{NFG} N_{i+1} : G_{i+1}$ . Since  $A_i^1$  is non-failing, this atom either succeeds or loops w.r.t. the program. If it succeeds, free variables of  $A_i^1$  may be substituted with terms of their corresponding type. Due to Definition 5.5, the resulting goal is an element of  $Ext(G_{i+1})$  whether or not the variables are bound during the evaluation of  $A_i^1$ . Thus, if  $\theta$  is the composition of substitutions on input variables from  $N_0$  to  $N_i$ , goals in  $Ext(G_0\theta)$  either loops w.r.t. an *NFG* transition or can be evaluated to a goal in  $Ext(G_{i+1})$

Let  $\theta_i$  be the substitutions on input variables from  $N_0$  to  $N_i$ . Then, every atom in the extended denotation of  $A_i^1\theta_i$  is non-failing and thus either succeeds or loops. If the free variables in the selected atom of  $G_0$  are bound, they are bound to an element of their respective type and thus included in  $Ext(G_1)$ . If some free variables stay unbound they are still elements of  $Ext(G_1)$  because of Definition 5.5. Thus, every element in  $G_0\theta_i$  can be evaluated to a goal in  $Ext(G_{i+1})$  or loops w.r.t. an *NFG* transition.

**Induction step for clause application** Assume the lemma holds for  $N_0 : G_0 \Rightarrow N_i : G_i$  and that we apply  $N_i : G_i \Rightarrow_c N_{i+1} : G_{i+1}$ . Let  $\sigma_T$  and be the substitutions on input variables due to this derivation step. Let  $\theta_i$  be the substitutions on input variables from  $N_0$  to  $N_i$ .

As in the base case, this clause is applicable to  $G_i$  if the actual values of the input variables are such that the substitutions on the corresponding terms succeed and thus, they are applicable to  $Ext(G_i\sigma_T)$ . Therefore, every goal in  $Ext(G_0\theta_i\sigma_T)$  can be evaluated to a goal in  $Ext(G_{i+1})$  or loops w.r.t. an *NFG* transition.  $\square$

## 5.3 Typed non-termination analysis with non-failing goals

In this section, we reformulate our non-termination conditions of the previous chapter for moded-typed SLD-trees with *NFG*. We prove that these conditions imply non-termination. We then show that program specialization can be used to further extend the applicability of these conditions.

### 5.3.1 Non-termination of inclusion loops

To prove non-termination, we prove that a path between two nodes  $N_b$  and  $N_e$  in a moded-typed SLD-derivation can be repeated infinitely often. To find such a path, we check three properties. Because the rules in the path must be applicable independent of the values of the input variables, no substitutions on the input variables may occur in the path from  $N_b$  to  $N_e$ . Because this path should be a loop,  $A_b^1$  must be an ancestor of  $A_e^1$ . Finally, because the goals corresponding to  $N_e$  must be able to repeat the loop,  $Ext(A_e^1)$  must be a subset of  $Ext(A_b^1)$ . We can show that these three conditions imply non-termination.

**Definition 5.8.** *In a moded-typed SLD-derivation with NFG  $D$ , nodes  $N_i : G_i$  and  $N_j : G_j$  are an **inclusion loop**,  $N_i : G_i \xrightarrow{mmg} N_j : G_j$ , if:*

- *No substitutions on input variables occur in the path from  $N_i$  to  $N_j$ .*
- $A_i^1 \prec_{anc} A_j^1$ .
- $A_j^1 \supset A_i^1$  □

An inclusion loop  $N_i : G_i \xrightarrow{mmg} N_j : G_j$  corresponds to an infinite loop for every goal of the extended denotation of  $G_i$ .

**Theorem 5.1** (Sufficiency of the inclusion loop). *Let  $N_i : G_i \xrightarrow{mmg} N_j : G_j$  be an inclusion loop in a moded-typed SLD-derivation with NFG  $D$  of a program  $P$  and a moded-typed query  $Q$ , then, every goal of the extended denotation of  $G_i$  is non-terminating w.r.t.  $P$ .* □

*Proof.* In the path from  $N_i$  to  $N_j$ , non-failing atoms can be solved using the NFG transition. If such an atom loops, the theorem holds. Thus, it is sufficient to prove that the path from  $N_i$  to  $N_j$  can be applied infinitely often if all selected atoms, from  $N_i$  to  $N_j$ , corresponding to an NFG transition finitely succeed.

Because  $A_i^1$  is an ancestor of  $A_j^1$ , only the selected atom of  $N_i$  influences if the sequence of clauses can be repeated infinitely often.

Because no substitutions on input variables occur in the path from  $N_i$  down to  $N_j$ , the corresponding sequence of derivation steps and NFG transitions is applicable to any atom in  $Ext(A_i^1)$ .

Since  $A_j^1 \supset A_i^1$ , this proves non-termination. □

Due to Proposition 5.1, an inclusion loop  $N_i : G_i \xrightarrow{mmg} N_j : G_j$  proves non-termination for a subset of concrete goals of the extended denotation of the top level goal, if no substitutions on input variables introduced by *NFG* transitions, occur in the path from  $N_0$  to  $N_i$ .

**Example 5.9.** *The moded-typed SLD-tree of Figure 5.2 can be used to prove non-termination of the longer program. The path from  $N_2$  to  $N_4$  satisfies the conditions of the inclusion loop. There are no substitutions on input variables between these nodes, the ancestor relation holds and  $Ext(longer([0, 0, 0 \mid \underline{M}]))$  is a subset of  $Ext(longer([0, 0 \mid \underline{M}]))$ .*

*Since there are no input variables added by NFG transitions, Proposition 5.1 proves that all atoms in  $Ext(longer([0 \mid \underline{M}]))$ , with  $\underline{M}$  of type  $T_{lz}$ , are non-terminating.*  $\square$

Because extended denotations are usually infinite sets, the third condition of Definition 5.8,  $A_j^1 \supset A_i^1$ , is hard to verify. In the previous chapter, we introduced a syntactic condition, based on a unifiability test between atoms, to verify whether the inclusion holds. This syntactic condition, formulated in Proposition 1 of the previous chapter, is still applicable in our current setting and can be used to automatically check Definition 5.8.

### 5.3.2 Input-generalizations

In the previous chapter, we defined *input-generalizations* to increase the applicability of our non-termination condition. The next example shows that this is also needed in the current setting.

**Example 5.10.** *We will illustrate the need for input generalizations with an adapted version of the program of Example 5.1.*

```
longer([0|L], X):-
    zeros(L),
    longer([0,0|L], f(X)).
zeros([]).
zeros([0|L]):- zeros(L).
```

*For this program, the following types and signatures are inferred:*

|  |                          |                       |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| $T_{lz} \rightarrow [ \ ] ; [T_0 \mid T_{lz}]$ | $T_f \rightarrow f(T_f)$ | $longer(T_{lz}, T_f)$ |
| $T_0 \rightarrow 0$                            |                          | $zeros(T_{lz})$       |

*Figure 5.4 shows the moded-typed SLD-derivation for the moded-typed query  $longer(\underline{L}, X)$ , with  $\underline{L}$  of type  $T_{lz}$ , using 3 as a repetition number. All pairs of nodes in the derivations fail the third condition of Definition 5.8.*  $\square$




Figure 5.5: Input-generalized derivation

Figure 5.4: Moded-typed SLD-tree of Example 5.10

To prove non-termination for such a program, we define an input-generalization. This input-generalization is such that proving non-termination of an input-generalized selected atom implies non-termination of the original goal.

**Definition 5.9.** *A moded-typed atom  $A^\alpha$  is an input-generalization of a moded-typed atom  $A$ , if there exist terms  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  in  $A$  and fresh moded-typed variables  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  with the same types as  $t_1, \dots, t_n$ , respectively, such that  $A^\alpha = A(\underline{I}_1 \rightarrow t_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n \rightarrow t_n)$  and  $\text{Var}(A^\alpha) \cap \text{Var}((t_1, \dots, t_n)) = \emptyset$ .  $\square$*

**Example 5.11.** *Let  $A$  be the atom  $\text{longer}([0, X, X], Y)$ :*

- *$\text{longer}([0|\underline{I}], Y)$  is an input-generalization of  $A$*
- *$\text{longer}(\underline{I}_1, \underline{I}_2)$  is an input-generalization of  $A$*
- *$\text{longer}([0, \underline{I}, X], Y)$  is not an input-generalization of  $A$ . This last example refers to the condition of the empty intersection of the variable sets.  $\square$*

To check if a path is non-terminating w.r.t. an input-generalized goal, we define an *input-generalized derivation*. This derivation is constructed by applying a path in a given derivation to the input-generalized selected atom of the first node in the path.

**Definition 5.10.** *Let  $N_i$  and  $N_j$  be nodes in a moded-typed SLD-derivation with NFG  $D$ , such that  $A_i^1 \prec_{anc} A_j^1$ . Let  $\langle C_1, \dots, C_n \rangle$  be the sequence of derivation*

steps and transitions from  $N_i$  to  $N_j$  and let  $A^\alpha$  be an input-generalization of  $A_i^1$ .

If  $\langle C_1, \dots, C_n \rangle$  can be applied to  $\leftarrow A^\alpha$ , the resulting derivation is called the **input-generalized derivation**  $D'$  for  $A^\alpha$ . The **input-generalized nodes**  $N_i^\alpha$  and  $N_j^\alpha$  are the first and last node of  $D'$ , respectively.  $\square$

Note that such a path in a moded-typed SLD-derivation is applicable to the input-generalized atom, if the selected atoms at all *NFG* transitions are still non-failing.

Non-termination of the input-generalized derivation implies non-termination of the original goal. Before we prove that this holds, we introduce an alternative definition of the extended denotation and give a lemma.

The following definition is an alternative characterization of the extended denotation. This definition contains the same elements as the extended denotation of Definition 5.5, up to variable renamings. This characterization will also be used in the following proofs.

**Definition 5.11.** Let  $A$  be a moded-typed atom with  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  as its typed variables with types  $T_1, \dots, T_n$ , respectively. The **extended denotation** of  $A$ ,  $Ext(A)$ , is

$$Let S = \{A(t_1 \rightarrow \underline{I}_1, \dots, t_n \rightarrow \underline{I}_n) \mid t_1 \in Den(T_1), \dots, t_n \in Den(T_n), t_1 \text{ is ground}, \dots, t_n \text{ is ground}\}$$

$$Ext(A) = \{I \mid I' \in S, I \text{ is more general than } I'\} \quad \square$$

**Lemma 5.1.** Let  $A^\alpha$  be an input-generalization of  $A$ , then  $A \triangleright A^\alpha$ .  $\square$

*Proof.* Note that again it is enough to prove that every element in  $S$  of Definition 5.11 is an element of  $Ext(A^\alpha)$ .

Let  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  be the input variables of  $A$  and  $\underline{I}_{n+1}, \dots, \underline{I}_m$  be the newly introduced moded-typed atoms in  $A^\alpha$ . For every concrete atom  $A_c$  of  $Den(A)$ ,  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  are replaced by ground terms. To construct an atom  $A_c^\alpha$  of  $Den(A^\alpha)$ , for which  $A_c$  is more general than  $A_c^\alpha$ , one replaces  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  by the same values as in  $A_c$  and  $\underline{I}_{n+1}, \dots, \underline{I}_m$  by instances of the corresponding terms,  $t_{n+1}, \dots, t_m$ , in  $A_c$ . Due to the condition that  $Var(A^\alpha) \cap Var((t_{n+1}, \dots, t_m)) = \emptyset$ ,  $A_c$  is more general than  $A_c^\alpha$  and thus  $A_c$  is an element of  $Ext(A^\alpha)$ .  $\square$

**Example 5.12.** To explain the condition on the intersection of the variables in Definition 5.9, consider the atom  $A = a(X, f(X))$ . If we omit the condition on the variables, we could consider  $A^\alpha = a(X, \underline{I})$  as an input-generalization.

$Ext(A)$  contains  $a(X, f(X))$ , which is not an element of  $Ext(a(X, \underline{I}))$ . So, the property that  $A \triangleright A^\alpha$  would not hold.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.2** (Non-termination with input-generalization). *Let  $N_i : G_i$  and  $N_j : G_j$  be nodes in a moded-typed SLD-derivation with NFG  $D$  of a program  $P$  for a query  $I$  and let  $A^\alpha$  an input-generalization of  $A_i^1$ . Let  $N_i^\alpha$  and  $N_j^\alpha$  be input-generalized nodes in the input-generalized derivation  $D'$  for  $A^\alpha$ .*

*If  $N_i^\alpha \xrightarrow{mmg} N_j^\alpha$ , then every concrete goal of the extended denotation of  $G_i$  is non-terminating w.r.t. program  $P$ .*  $\square$

*Proof.* According to Lemma 5.1,  $A \triangleright A^\alpha$  and according to Theorem 5.1, every goal in  $Ext(A^\alpha)$  is non-terminating. Since  $N_i^\alpha \xrightarrow{mmg} N_j^\alpha$ ,  $N_i$  is an ancestor of  $N_j$  and thus, every goal in  $Ext(G_i)$  must be non-terminating as well.  $\square$

**Example 5.13.** *To prove non-termination of the program in Example 5.10,  $longer([0, 0 | \underline{M}], f(\underline{I}))$  can be used as an input-generalization of  $A_2^1$  in Figure 5.4.*

*Figure 5.5, shows the input-generalized derivation of  $N_2$  to  $N_4$  for  $longer([0, 0 | \underline{M}], f(\underline{I}))$ . This derivation is an inclusion loop:  $N_2^\alpha \xrightarrow{mmg} N_4^\alpha$ . Therefore, non-termination of this program w.r.t. the concrete goals of  $Ext(\leftarrow longer([0, 0 | \underline{M}], f(X)))$  is proven by Proposition 5.2.*  $\square$

### 5.3.3 Program specialization

In Example 5.2, we discussed a class of programs, related to aliased variables, for which current non-termination analyzers fail to prove non-termination. We illustrated that program specialization can be used to prove non-termination of such programs. The main intuition is that non-termination analysis techniques have difficulties with treating queries with aliased variables. Program specialization often reduces the aliasing, due to argument filtering. So, in the context of aliasing, applying program specialization often improves the applicability of the analysis.

Program specialization can also be used in combination with the NFG transition. When solving a non-failing atom, all variables in the atom are substituted with new input variables. These input variables give an overestimation of the possible values after evaluating the non-failing atom. Program specialization can produce more instantiated, but equivalent clauses. These more instantiated clauses give a better approximation of the possible values after evaluating the non-failing atom. We illustrate this with an example.

**Example 5.14.** *The following program generates the infinite list of Hamming numbers in symbolic notation. `hamming/0` starts the computation initializing the list of hamming numbers to `[s(0)]`. `hamming([N|Ns])` keeps a list of hamming numbers, ordered from small to large. Three new hamming numbers are generated using `times/3`, which defines multiplication on the symbolic notation. Then, `insert/3` merges these three numbers with `Ns` and removes duplicates, resulting in the list for the next iteration. The code for `insert/3` and `times/3` is omitted.*

```
hamming:- hamming([s(0)]).
hamming([N|Ns]):- times(s(s(0)),N,N2),
                  times(s(s(s(0))),N,N3),
                  times(s(s(s(s(0))))),N,N5),
                  insert([N2,N3,N5],Ns,Res),
                  hamming(Res).
```

*PolyTypes infers the following type definition:*

$$T_s \rightarrow 0; s(T_s) \qquad T_l \rightarrow [ ]; [T_s \mid T_l]$$

*The arguments of `hamming/1` and `insert/3` are of type  $T_l$ , the other arguments are of type  $T_s$ . Non-failure analysis shows that `insert/3` and `times/3` are non-failing if their last arguments are free variables.*

*When building the moded-typed SLD-tree for the query `hamming`, solving the non-failing atoms by applying an NFG transition, the moded-typed goal `hamming(Res)` is obtained at the recursive call. In this goal, `Res` is introduced by an NFG transition. When applying clause 2 to this goal, `Res` is substituted by a compound term and thus, non-termination of `hamming` cannot be proven.*

*To prove non-termination of `hamming`, one needs to know that the list in the recursive call `hamming(Res)` is again of the form `[N|Ns]`. This can be done using the program specialization technique: more specific programs. This technique generates a more instantiated version of the program. For the running program, it generates the following recursive clause for `hamming`:*

```
hamming([N|Ns]):- times(s(s(0)),N,N2),
                  times(s(s(s(0))),N,N3),
                  times(s(s(s(s(0))))),N,N5),
                  insert([N2,N3,N5],Ns,[R|Res]),
                  hamming([R|Res]).
```

*Because of this more instantiated clause, proving non-termination for `hamming` using NFG transitions to solve `times/3` and `insert/3` is straightforward.  $\square$*



## 5.4 Summary

In this chapter, we identified classes of logic programs for which previous analyzers fail to prove non-termination and we extended our non-termination analysis to overcome these limitations. As in the previous chapter, non-termination is proven by constructing a symbolic derivation tree, representing all derivations for a class of queries, and then proving that a path in this tree can be repeated infinitely.

The most important class of programs for which previous analyzers fail, are programs for which no fixed sequence of clauses can be repeated infinitely. We have shown that non-failure information ([17]) can be used to abstract away from the exact sequence of clauses needed to solve non-failing goals. To use this non-failure information, type information is added to the symbolic derivation tree and a special *NFG* transition is introduced to solve non-failing atoms. As far as we know, this is the first time that non-failure information is used for non-termination analysis.

We have shown that program specialization ([26]) can be used to overcome another limitation of current analyzers. If non-termination cannot be proven due to aliased variables, redundant argument filtering may remove these duplicated variables from the program. Specialization can also be used in combination with the *NFG* transition. Program specialization may produce more instantiated clauses, giving a better approximation of the possible values after solving the non-failing goal.

## Reference

The work in this chapter was presented at LOPSTR 2010 and is published in [55].



## Chapter 6

# Non-termination Analysis for Logic Programs with Integer Arithmetics

This chapter extends our non-termination condition for programs containing integer arithmetics. We modify the moded SLD-tree to handle a subset of the build-in predicates for integer arithmetics, commonly found in Prolog implementations. LP-check ensures finiteness of the tree and detects paths that may correspond to infinite loops. For every such path, two analyses are combined to identify classes of non-terminating queries. In the first phase, non-termination of the logic part of the program is proven by assuming that all comparisons between integer expressions succeed. We will show that only a minor adaption of our non-termination analysis is needed to achieve this. In the second phase, given the moded query, integer arguments are identified and constraints over these arguments are formulated, such that solutions for these constraints correspond to non-terminating queries. The chapter is structured as follows. Section 6.1 defines the subset of integer predicates that we consider in the chapter. Section 6.2 introduces the first phase of our analysis, proves non-termination for the logic part of the computation. Section 6.3 the second phase of our analysis, proves non-termination for the integer part of the computation. Section 6.4 describes our prototype analyzer and discusses our results. Finally, Section 6.5 summarizes the chapter.

## 6.1 Integer arithmetics

Prolog implementations contain special purpose predicates for handling integer arithmetics. Examples are  $is/2$ ,  $\geq /2$ ,  $:= /2$ ,  $\dots$

**Definition 6.1.** *An expression  $Expr$  is an integer expression if it can be constructed by the following recursive definition.*

$$Expr = z \in \mathbb{Z} \mid -Expr \mid Expr + Expr \mid Expr - Expr \mid Expr * Expr \quad \square$$

An atom " $V$  is  $Expr$ ", with  $V$  a free variable and  $Expr$  an integer expression, is called an *integer constructor*. An atom  $Expr1 \circ Expr2$  is called an *integer condition* if  $Expr1$  and  $Expr2$  are integer expressions and  $\circ \in \{>, >=, <, <=, :=, \neq\}$ .

## 6.2 Non-termination of the Logic part

This section introduces the first part of our non-termination analysis for programs containing integer arithmetics. In the first phase, we focus on the logic part of the computation and assume the integer conditions succeed. This section introduces a condition to detect that a program and moded query is either non-terminating or fails due to the evaluation of an integer condition. This condition is obtained by adapting our non-termination condition from Chapter 4. In the next section we will generate additional constraints on the class of queries to obtain classes of non-terminating queries.

### 6.2.1 Moded SLD-tree for programs with integer arithmetics

The first step of the extension is rather straightforward. The extensions to the moded SLD-tree of Chapter 3 are limited to the introduction of the label *integer variable* and additional transitions to handle integer constructors and integer conditions. Integer variables denote an unknown integer and will also be represented by underlining the name of the variable. An integer constructor, i.e.,  $is/2$ , is applicable if the first argument is a free variable and the second argument is an integer expression. The application of an integer constructor labels the free variable as an integer variable. An integer condition, e.g.,  $\geq /2$ , is applicable if both arguments are integer expressions. Since integer variables denote unknown integers, integer expressions are allowed to contain integer variables. Applications of integer constructors and integer conditions in the

moded SLD-tree are denoted by derivation steps  $N_i : G_i \Rightarrow_{cons} N_{i+1} : G_{i+1}$  and  $N_i : G_i \Rightarrow_{cond} N_{i+1} : G_{i+1}$ , respectively.




Figure 6.1: Moded SLD-tree *count\_to*

**Example 6.1.** *The following program, `count_to`, is a faulty implementation of a predicate generating the list starting from 0 up to a given number. The considered class of queries is represented by the moded query  $\leftarrow \text{count\_to}(\underline{N}, L)$  with  $\underline{N}$  an integer variable.*

```
count_to(N, L) :- count(0, N, L).
count(N, N, [N]).
count(M, N, [M|L]) :- M > N, M1 is M+1, count(M1, N, L).
```

*In the last clause, the integer condition should be  $M < N$  instead of  $M > N$ . Due to this error, the program:*

- *fails for the queries for which  $\underline{N} > 0$  holds,*
- *succeeds for  $\leftarrow \text{count\_to}(0, L)$ ,*
- *loops for the queries for which  $\underline{N} < 0$  holds.*

*Figure 6.1 shows the moded SLD-tree for the considered query, constructed using LP-check. LP-check cuts clause 3 at node  $N_9$ .*  $\square$

Note that by ignoring the possible values for the integer variables when constructing the tree, some derivations in it may not be applicable to any considered query. For example the refutations at nodes  $N_6$  and  $N_{10}$  in the previous example cannot be reached by the considered queries.

**Definition 6.2.** Let  $C$  be an integer condition or expression and  $N_i$  and  $N_j$  two nodes in a moded SLD-tree  $D$ . Let  $Cons$  be the set of all integer constructors occurring as selected atom in a node  $N_p$  ( $i \leq p \leq j$ ) in  $D$ .

The function  $apply\_cons(C, N_i, N_j)$  returns the integer condition or expression obtained by exhaustively applying  $\underline{I} \setminus Expr$  to  $C$ , for any  $\underline{I}$  is  $Expr \in Cons$ .  $\square$

Since we only apply integer constructors if the second argument is an integer expression, all integer conditions in a derivation can be expressed in terms of the integer variables of the query.

**Lemma 6.1.** Let  $N_i$  be a node in a moded SLD-tree for a query  $\leftarrow Q$  with integer variables  $Int$ . Let  $cond$  be an integer condition in the derivation to  $N_i$ , then  $apply\_cons(cond, N_0, N_i)$  returns an integer condition over integer variables  $Int$ .

*Proof.* This follows from the requirement of the derivation steps  $cond$  and  $cons$  for the arguments to be of the correct type.  $\square$

First, we formalize the correspondence between moded SLD-derivations and concrete SLD-derivations.

**Theorem 6.1.** Let  $N_i$  be a node in a moded SLD-tree for a query  $\leftarrow Q$  with integers  $Int$ . Let  $Cons$  be the set of all integer constructors in the derivation to  $N_i$ , let  $Cond$  be the set of integer conditions on the derivation and let  $\sigma$  be the composition of all substitutions on input variables in the derivation to  $N_i$ .

Then, the derivation to  $N_i$  is applicable to any query in  $Den(\leftarrow Q\sigma)$  such that all conditions in  $\{apply\_cons(cond, N_0, N_i) \mid cond \in Cond\}$  hold.

*Proof.* By induction on the number of derivation steps in a moded SLD-derivation for a query  $\leftarrow Q$  with (non-integer) input variables  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  and integer variables  $Int_1, \dots, Int_m$ .

Note that queries in  $Den(\leftarrow Q)$  corresponds to a grounding substitution on the (non-integer) input variables of  $Q$  and a value for the integer variables in  $Q$ . Also note that because integer constructors are only applied with integer expressions as second argument, integer conditions  $cond$  in a derivation to  $N_i$  can always be expressed over the integers variables of the query using  $apply\_cons(cond, N_0, N_i)$ .

**Base case: clause application.** Let  $c$  be the clause applied to the query  $\leftarrow Q$  in the considered derivation, let  $\sigma$  be the substitution corresponding to this clause application and let  $\sigma_I$  be the subset of bindings on input variables. Then,  $c$  is applicable to any element of  $Den(\leftarrow Q)$  for which the ground terms (due to the grounding substitution) and the terms in  $\sigma_I$  are unifiable for all input variables. Thus,  $c$  is applicable to any query in  $Den(\leftarrow Q\sigma_I)$ .

**Base case: Integer condition.** If  $Q$  is an integer condition, then solving it results in a refutation and it's clear that  $N_0 : \leftarrow Q \Rightarrow_{cond} N_1$  is applicable to any query in  $Den(\leftarrow Q)$  for which the values corresponding to the integer variables of  $Q$  are such that the condition holds.

**Induction step: clause application.** Assume the theorem holds for  $N_0 : \leftarrow G_0 \Rightarrow N_i : \leftarrow G_i$  and that we apply  $N_i : \leftarrow G_i \Rightarrow_c N_{i+1} : \leftarrow G_{i+1}$ . Let  $\sigma_I$  and be the substitutions on input variables due to this derivation step. Let  $\theta$  be the composition of substitutions on input variables from  $N_0$  to  $N_i$  and let  $Cs$  be the constraints due to integer conditions in the derivation up to this node.

As in the base case, this clause is applicable to  $G_i$  if the actual values of the input variables due to the grounding substitution unify with the terms in  $\sigma_I$ . Therefore, every goal in  $Den(G_0\theta\sigma_I)$  can be evaluated to a goal in  $Den(G_{i+1})$  if the values corresponding to the integer variables are such that  $Cs$  holds.

**Induction step: Integer condition.** Assume the theorem holds for  $N_0 : \leftarrow G_0 \Rightarrow N_i : \leftarrow G_i$  and that we apply  $N_i : \leftarrow G_i \Rightarrow_{cond} N_{i+1} : \leftarrow G_{i+1}$ . Let  $\theta$  be the composition of substitutions on input variables from  $N_0$  to  $N_i$  and let  $Cs$  be the constraints due other integer conditions in the derivation.

The selected atom of  $G_i$ ,  $A_i^1$ , only contains integer variables and  $apply\_cons(A_i^1, N_0, N_i)$  results in a condition over the integer variables of the query and thus, this derivation is applicable to any query in  $Den(\leftarrow Q\theta)$  such that  $Cs \wedge apply\_cons(A_i^1, N_0, N_i)$  holds.

This concludes the proof. □

## 6.2.2 Adapting the non-termination condition

In this part of the analysis, we focus on the logical part of the computation and assume the integer conditions to succeed. We adapt our non-termination

condition of Chapter 4 to prove that every instance of a moded query is either non-terminating or terminates due to the evaluation of an integer condition. However, while we assume the integer conditions succeed, we will adapt our condition to ensure that integer constructors and integer conditions are called with correct arguments. We need to guarantee that integer constructors are repeatedly evaluated with a free variable and an integer expression as arguments and that integer conditions are repeatedly evaluated with integer expressions as arguments.

To prove the repeated behavior on integer constructors and integer expressions, the *integer-similar* relation is defined. Intuitively, given some loop in the computation, if an atom at the end of the loop is integer-similar to an atom at the start of the loop, then it will provide the required integer expressions to the first atom. First, we introduce positions to identify subterms and a function to obtain a subterm from a given position.

**Definition 6.3.** Let  $L$  be a list of natural numbers, called a position, and  $A$  a moded atom or term. The function  $\text{subterm}(L, A)$  returns the subterm obtained by:

- if  $L = [I]$  and  $A = f(A_1, \dots, A_I, A_{I+1}, \dots, A_n)$  then  $\text{subterm}(L, A) = A_I$
- else if  $L = [I|T]$  and  $A = f(A_1, \dots, A_I, A_{I+1}, \dots, A_n)$  then  $\text{subterm}(L, A) = \text{subterm}(T, A_I)$  □

A moded atom  $A$  is integer-similar to a moded atom  $B$  if it has integer expressions on all positions corresponding to integer expressions in  $B$ .

**Definition 6.4.** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be moded atoms.  $A$  is integer-similar to  $B$  if for every integer expression  $t_B$  of  $B$ , with  $\text{subterm}(L, B) = t_B$ , there exists an integer expression  $t_A$  of  $A$ , with  $\text{subterm}(L, A) = t_A$ . □

**Example 6.2.** Let  $M$  be an integer variable in following examples.

- $\text{count}(0, \underline{N}, L)$  is integer-similar to  $\text{count}(\underline{M}, \underline{N}, L)$
- $\text{count}(\underline{M}, \underline{N}, L)$  is integer-similar to  $\text{count}(0, \underline{N}, L)$
- $\text{count}(\underline{M} + 1, \underline{N}, L)$  is integer-similar to  $\text{count}(\underline{M}, \underline{N}, L)$
- $\text{count}(\underline{M}, \underline{N}, L)$  is not integer-similar to  $\text{count}(\underline{M} + 1, \underline{N}, L)$

Note that the last one is a counterexample because  $\text{count}(\underline{M} + 1, \underline{N}, L)$  has integer expressions on  $[1, 1]$  and  $[1, 2]$ , while  $\text{count}(\underline{M}, \underline{N}, L)$  does not have any subterms on these positions. □



We adapt our non-termination condition of Chapter 4 by requiring that the selected atoms of  $N_b$  and  $N_e$  are integer-similar.

**Definition 6.5.** Let  $N_b$  and  $N_e$  be nodes in a moded SLD-tree for a moded query  $Q$ , then  $N_b \xrightarrow{mmg} N_e$  is called a moded more general loop if:

- $A_b^1$  is an ancestor of  $A_e^1$
- no substitutions on input variables occur from  $N_b$  to  $N_e$
- $A_e^1$  is moded more general than  $A_b^1$
- $A_e^1$  is integer-similar to  $A_b^1$  □

Now we prove that a moded more general loop implies non-termination if there are values for the integers such that all integer conditions succeed. First, we introduce a lemma.

**Lemma 6.2.** Let  $N_b \xrightarrow{mmg} N_e$  be a moded more general loop and let  $D$  be the derivation to  $N_e$  followed by repeatedly applying the derivation steps from  $N_b$  to  $N_e$ , then all integer conditions in  $D$  are evaluated with two integer expressions as arguments and all integer constructors in  $D$  are evaluated with a free variable and an integer expression as arguments. □

*Proof.* Since integer constructors and integer conditions are only applied if their arguments are of the correct type, the lemma holds for the derivation to  $N_e$ .

Due to the definition of the moded more general relation, a position corresponding to a free variable in  $A_b^1$  must correspond to a free variable in  $A_e^1$ . This also holds for all following iterations and thus integer constructors are always evaluated with a free variables as a first argument.

To prove that the second argument of an integer constructor and both arguments of integer conditions are integer expressions when they are evaluated, it is enough to prove that positions corresponding to integer expressions in  $A_b^1$  also correspond to integer expressions in the following iterations. This is guaranteed by Definition 6.4. □

**Theorem 6.2.** Let  $N_b \xrightarrow{mmg} N_e$  be a moded more general loop in a derivation for a moded query  $\leftarrow Q$  and let  $\theta$  be the composition of the substitutions on input variables in the derivation to  $N_e$ , then every query in  $Den(\leftarrow Q\theta)$  is non-terminating or fails due to the evaluation of an integer condition.

*Proof.* We need to prove that the sequence of derivation steps from  $N_b$  to  $N_e$  can be applied infinitely often to any goal in  $Den(Q')$ , assuming that all integer

conditions in this derivation succeed. Although we can assume all integer conditions succeed, integer conditions and constructors must still be evaluated with terms of the correct type. Lemma 6.2 already proves this is the case.

Because  $A_b^1$  is an ancestor of  $A_e^1$ , only the selected atom of  $N_b$  influences if the sequence of derivation steps can be repeated infinitely often.

Because no substitutions on input variables occur in the path from  $N_b$  down to  $N_e$ , the corresponding sequence of derivation steps is applicable to any atom in  $Den(A_b^1)$  (assuming that integer conditions are evaluated with values such that they succeed). Furthermore, it is also applicable to queries that are more general, but integer-similar to queries in  $Den(\leftarrow A_b^1)$ . Let this set of queries be  $S$ .

Since  $A_j^1 \triangleright A_i^1$ , every query in  $Den(\leftarrow A_e^1)$  is also a member of  $S$ . This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Example 6.3.** *The path between nodes  $N_5$  and  $N_9$  in Figure 6.1 satisfies the conditions of Theorem 6.5. There are no substitutions on input variables from  $N_5$  to  $N_9$  and thus, every query in  $Den(\leftarrow \text{count\_to}(\underline{N}, L))$  is either non-terminating or fails due to the evaluation of an integer condition. Note that although  $\leftarrow \text{count\_to}(0, L)$  has a succeeding derivation to  $N_2$ , its derivation to  $N_9$  fails due to the integer condition  $0 > \underline{N}$ .*  $\square$

To verify the moded more general relation and the integer-similar to relation of Definition 6.5, we strengthen Proposition 1 of Chapter 4 to imply both the moded more general relation and the integer-similar to relation.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be moded atoms. Let  $A_1$  and  $B_1$  be renamings of these atoms such that they do not share variables.  $A$  is moded more general than  $B$  and  $A$  is integer-similar to  $B$ , if  $A_1$  and  $B_1$  are unifiable with most general unifier  $\{V_1 \setminus t_1, \dots, V_n \setminus t_n\}$ , such that for each binding  $V_i \setminus t_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , either:*

- $V_i \in \text{Var}(B_1)$  and  $V_i$  is labeled as integer and  $t_i$  is an integer expression, or
- $V_i \in \text{Var}(B_1)$  and  $V_i$  is labeled as input but not as integer variable, or
- $V_i \in \text{Var}(A_1)$ ,  $V_i$  is not labeled as input, no variable of  $\text{Var}(t_i)$  is labeled as input and  $t_i$  does not contain integers.  $\square$

*Proof.* To prove that  $A$  is integer-similar to  $B$ , we must show that every position corresponding to an integer expression in  $B$  corresponds to an integer expression

in  $A$ . This follows from the restriction that normal variables are not allowed to be substituted by terms containing integer variables or integers (third item). To prove that the proposition implies that  $A$  is moded more general than  $B$  we refer to the proof of Proposition 1 in Chapter 4.  $\square$

**Example 6.4.** *Since the selected atoms of nodes  $N_5$  and  $N_9$  in Figure 6.1 are variants, Proposition 6.1 holds.*  $\square$

### 6.3 Non-termination of the Integer part

This section introduces the second part of our analysis. If Theorem 6.2 holds, we generate extra constraints on the integer variables proving non-termination. These constraints consist of reachability constraints, identifying queries for which the derivation up till the last node is applicable, and an implication proving that the integer conditions will also succeed in the following iterations. First we define how to obtain these constraints and then we apply transformations to solve these constraints automatically.

**Example 6.5.** *As a first example, we introduce the constraints for the path between  $N_5$  and  $N_9$  in the moded SLD-tree of  $\text{count\_to}$  in Figure 6.1. For this path, Theorem 6.5 holds and thus every query denoted by  $\leftarrow \text{count\_to}(\underline{N}, L)$  is either non-terminating or terminates due to an integer condition.*

*To restrict the class of considered queries to those for which the derivation to  $N_9$  is applicable, all integer conditions in the derivation are expressed in terms of the integers of the query, yielding  $0 > \underline{N}$  and  $0 + 1 > \underline{N}$ .*

*For this program and considered class of queries, the condition  $0 > \underline{N}$  implies that the derivation is applicable until node  $N_9$ . The following implication states that if the condition of node  $N_7$  holds for any two values  $M$  and  $N$ , then it also holds for the values of the next iteration.*

$$\forall M, N \in \mathbb{Z} : M > N \implies M + 1 > N$$

*This implication is correct and thus proves non-termination for the considered queries if the precondition holds in the first iteration. This is the case for all queries in  $\text{Den}(\leftarrow \text{count\_to}(\underline{N}, L))$  with  $0 > \underline{N}$  since the value corresponding to  $M$  in the first iteration is 0 and the value corresponding to  $N$  is  $\underline{N}$ . This proves non-termination of all considered queries for which  $0 > \underline{N}$ .*  $\square$

In the following example, applicability of the derivation does not imply non-termination. To detect a class of non-terminating queries, a domain constraint is added to the pre- and postcondition of the implication.

**Example 6.6.**

`constants(I,J):- I ::= 2, In is J*2, Jn is I-J, constants(In,Jn).`

The clause in `constants` is applicable to any goal with `constants(2, J)` as selected atom, with J an integer variable. Since the first argument in the next iteration is the value corresponding to `J*2`, only goals with the selected atom `constants(2,1)` are non-terminating for this program.

Since applicability of the derivation does not imply non-termination, a similar implication as in the previous example is false,  $\forall I, J \in \mathbb{Z} : I = 2 \implies J * 2 = 2$ . To overcome this, a constraint is added to the pre- and post-condition of this implication, restricting the considered values of J to an unknown set of integers, called its domain.

$$\exists Dom_j \subset \mathbb{Z}, \forall I, J \in \mathbb{Z} : I = 2, J \in Dom_j \implies J * 2 = 2, I - J \in Dom_j$$

The resulting implication is true for  $Dom_j = \{1\}$ . By requiring that the considered moded query satisfies both the reachability constraint and the additional constraint in the pre-condition, the non-terminating query  $\leftarrow constants(2,1)$  is obtained.  $\square$

All information needed to construct these constraints can be obtained from the moded SLD-tree.

The constraints guaranteeing a derivation to  $N_j$  to be applicable, can be obtained using  $apply\_cons(Cond, N_0, N_i)$  for any integer condition *Cond* in a node  $N_i$  in the considered derivation. For a path from  $N_b$  to  $N_e$ , the precondition of the implication is obtained using  $apply\_cons(Cond, N_b, N_i)$ , for each condition *Cond* in a node  $N_i$  between nodes  $N_b$  to  $N_e$  and universally quantifying the integer variables of  $N_b$ .

**Example 6.7.** The derivation to  $N_9$  in Figure 6.1, contains integer conditions in nodes  $N_3$  and  $N_7$ . These are expressed on the integer variable of the query, N, using  $apply\_cons$ .

- $apply\_cons(0 > \underline{N}, N_0, N_3) = 0 > \underline{N}$
- $apply\_cons(\underline{M1} > \underline{N}, N_0, N_7) = 0 + 1 > \underline{N}$

To obtain the precondition of the implication, the integer condition in  $N_7$  is expressed in terms of the integer variables of  $N_5$ .

- $apply\_cons(\underline{M1} > \underline{N}, N_5, N_7) = \underline{M1} > \underline{N}$

Universally quantifying these variables yields the precondition.  $\square$

To obtain the consequence of the implication for a path from  $N_b$  to  $N_e$ , one first replaces the integer variables of  $N_b$  in the precondition by the corresponding integer variables of  $N_e$ . Then, *apply\_cons* is used to express the consequence in terms of the values in the previous iteration.

**Definition 6.6.** *Let LHS be the precondition of an implication, consisting of integer conditions and constraints of the form  $I \in Dom_I$ . Let  $N_i$  and  $N_j$  be two nodes in a moded SLD-derivation such that all integer variables in LHS are in  $A_i^1$  and let  $\underline{I}_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n$  be all integer variables of  $A_i^1$ .*

*If there exist subterms of  $A_j^1$ ,  $t_1, \dots, t_n$ , such that  $\forall L : \text{subterm}(L, A_i^1) = \underline{I}_p \implies \text{subterm}(L, A_j^1) = t_p, 1 \leq p \leq n$ , then  $\text{replace}(\text{LHS}, N_i, N_j)$  is obtained by applying  $\{\underline{I}_1 \setminus t_1, \dots, \underline{I}_n \setminus t_n\}$  to all constraints in LHS.  $\square$*

**Example 6.8.** *In Example 6.7, we generated the precondition of the implication,  $\underline{M1} > \underline{N}$ . To obtain the consequence,  $\text{replace}(\underline{M1} > \underline{N}, N_5, N_9)$  is applied, yielding  $\underline{M2} > \underline{N}$ . Then, the integer variable of  $N_9$ ,  $\underline{M2}$ , is expressed in terms of the integer variables of  $N_5$  using  $\text{apply\_cons}(\underline{M2} > \underline{N}, N_5, N_9) = \underline{M1} + 1 > \underline{N}$ .*

*Adding the domains to the pre- and postcondition yields the desired implication:*  
 $\exists Dom_N, Dom_{M1} \subset \mathbb{Z}, \forall N, M1 \in \mathbb{Z} : M1 > N, N \in Dom_N, M1 \in Dom_{M1} \implies$   
 $M1 + 1 > N, N \in Dom_N, M1 + 1 \in Dom_M$   $\square$

Adding these constraints to the class of queries detected by Theorem 6.5, yields a class of non-terminating queries.

### 6.3.1 Proving that the constraints on integers are solvable

The previous subsection introduced constraints, implying that all integer conditions in a considered derivation succeed. In this subsection, we introduce a technique to check if these constraints have solutions, using a constraint-based approach. Symbolic coefficients represent values for the integers in the query and domains in the implication, for which the considered path is a loop. After these coefficients are introduced, the implication is transformed into a set of equivalent implications over natural numbers. These implications can then be solved automatically in the constraint-based approach, based on Proposition 3 of [35].

**Proposition 6.2** (Proposition 3 of [35]). *Let prem be a polynomial over  $n$  variables and conc a polynomial over 1 variable, both with natural coefficients,*

where *conc* is not a constant. Moreover, let  $p_1, \dots, p_{n+1}, q_1, \dots, q_{n+1}$  be arbitrary polynomials with integer coefficients<sup>1</sup> over the variables  $\overline{X}$ . If

$\forall \overline{X} \in \mathbb{N} : \text{conc}(p_{n+1}) - \text{conc}(q_{n+1}) - \text{prem}(p_1, \dots, p_n) + \text{prem}(q_1, \dots, q_n) \geq 0$   
is valid, then  $\forall \overline{X} \in \mathbb{N} : p_1 \geq q_1, \dots, p_n \geq q_n \implies p_{n+1} \geq q_{n+1}$  is also valid.  $\square$

### Introducing the symbolic coefficients.

To represent half-open domains in the implication by symbolic coefficients, the domains are described by two symbolic coefficients, one upper or lower limit and one for the direction. Constraints of the form  $\text{Exp} \in \text{Dom}_I$  in the implication, are replaced by constraints of the form  $d_I * \text{Exp} \geq d_I * c_I$  with  $d_I$  either 1 or  $-1$ , describing the domain  $\{c_I, c_I - 1, \dots\}$  for  $d_I = -1$  and  $\{c_I, c_I + 1, \dots\}$  for  $d_I = 1$ . The values to be inferred for the integers of the query should satisfy the precondition of the implication. Of course, the symbolic coefficients  $c_I$  should also be consistent with the values of the integers in the query.

**Example 6.9.** In Example 6.5, we introduced constraints on the integer variable  $\underline{N}$ ,  $0 > \underline{N}$  and  $0 + 1 > \underline{N}$ , proving non-termination for queries in  $\text{Den}(\leftarrow \text{count\_to}(\underline{N}, L))$ . By convention, we denote the symbolic coefficients as constants. For the integer variable  $\underline{N}$ , we introduce the symbolic coefficient  $n$ .

The implication introduced in Example 6.5, for the path from  $N_5$  to  $N_9$  in Figure 6.1, does not contain constraints on the domains. When adding these constraints to the pre- and postcondition, we obtain the following implication.

$$\forall M, N \in \mathbb{Z} : M > N, N \in \text{Dom}_N, M \in \text{Dom}_M \implies \\ M + 1 > N, N \in \text{Dom}_N, M + 1 \in \text{Dom}_M$$

Representing these domains by symbolic coefficients yields the following implication.

$$\forall M, N \in \mathbb{Z} : M > N, d_N * N \geq d_N * c_N, d_M * M \geq d_M * c_M \implies \\ M + 1 > N, d_N * N \geq d_N * c_N, d_M * (M + 1) \geq d_M * c_M$$

To guarantee that the precondition succeeds for the considered derivation,  $c_M$  and  $c_N$  are required to be the values for  $\underline{M}$  and  $\underline{N}$  in node  $N_5$ . Combining these constraints implies non-termination for the query  $\leftarrow \text{count\_to}(n, L)$ , for which the following constraints are satisfied with some unknown integers  $c_N, c_M, d_N$  and  $d_M$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>Proposition 3 in [35] states natural coefficients, but the proposition also holds for polynomials with integer coefficients.

- (1)  $0 > n, 0 + 1 > n$  to guarantee applicability of the derivation
- (2)  $c_N = n, c_M = 0 + 1$  to guarantee that the precondition holds
- (3)  $d_N = 1 \vee d_N = -1, d_M = 1 \vee d_M = -1,$
- (4)  $\forall M, N \in \mathbb{Z} : M > N, d_N * N \geq d_N * c_N, d_M * M \geq d_M * c_M \implies$   
 $M + 1 > N, d_N * N \geq d_N * c_N, d_M * (M + 1) \geq d_M * c_M$  to prove that the  
 condition succeeds infinitely often.

Due to the implication,  $d_M$  has to be 1.  $d_N$  can be either 1 or  $-1$ .  $\square$

To be able to infer singleton domains, we allow the constant describing the direction of the interval to be 0. If in such a constant,  $d_I$ , is zero, the constraints on the domain are satisfied trivially because they simplify to  $0 \geq 0$ . To guarantee that the domain is indeed a singleton when  $d_I$  is inferred to be zero, a constraint of the form  $(1 - d_I^2)Exp = (1 - d_I^2) * c_I$  is added to the postcondition for every constraint  $d_I * I \geq d_I * c_I$ . This constraint is trivially satisfied for half-open domains and proves that  $\{c_I\}$  is the domain in the case that  $d_I = 0$ .

**Example 6.10.** In Example 6.6, we introduced constraints on the integer variables  $\underline{I}$  and  $\underline{J}$ , proving non-termination for queries in  $Den(\leftarrow \text{constants}(\underline{I}, \underline{J}))$ . Introducing symbolic coefficient  $i$  and  $j$  for the integers of the query and for the domains of  $\underline{I}$  and  $\underline{J}$ , yields the following constraints.

- (1)  $i = 2$  to guarantee applicability of the derivation
- (2)  $c_I = i, c_J = j$  to guarantee that the precondition holds
- (3)  $d_I \leq 1, d_I \geq -1, d_J \leq 1, d_J \geq -1,$
- (4)  $\forall I, J \in \mathbb{Z} : I = 2, d_I * I \geq d_I * c_I, d_J * J \geq d_J * c_J \implies$   
 $J * 2 = 2, d_I * (J * 2) \geq d_I * c_I, (1 - d_I^2) * (J * 2) = (1 - d_I^2) * c_I,$   
 $d_J * (I - J) \geq d_J * c_J, (1 - d_J^2) * (I - J) = (1 - d_J^2) * c_J$

The implication in (4) can only be satisfied with  $d_J$  equal to zero.  $\square$

### To implications over the natural numbers

The symbolic coefficients to be inferred which represent the domains, allow us to transform the implication over  $\mathbb{Z}$  to an equivalent implication over  $\mathbb{N}$ .

- for  $d_I = 1$ , any integer in  $\{c_I, c_I + 1, \dots\}$  that satisfies the precondition is in  $\{c_I + d_I * N \mid N \in \mathbb{N}\}$

- for  $d_I = -1$ , any integer in  $\{c_I, c_I - 1, \dots\}$  that satisfies the precondition is in  $\{c_I + d_I * N \mid N \in \mathbb{N}\}$
- for  $d_I = 0$ , any integer in  $\{c_I\}$  that satisfies the precondition is in  $\{c_I + d_I * N \mid N \in \mathbb{N}\}$

Therefore, we obtain an equivalent implication over the natural numbers by replacing each integer  $I$  by its corresponding expression  $c_I + d_I * N$  and replacing the universal quantifier over  $I$  by a quantifier over  $N$ .

### Automation by a translation to Diophantine constraints

To solve the resulting constraints, we use the approach of [35]. Constraints of the form  $A ::= B$  in the implication, are replaced by the conjunction  $A \geq B, B \geq A$ . Constraints of the form  $A = / = B$ , yield two disjunctive cases. One obtained by replacing the  $= / =$  in the pre- and postcondition by  $>$  and one obtained by replacing it by  $<$ . The other conditions – i.e.  $>$ ,  $<$  and  $\leq$  – are transformed into  $\geq$ -constraints in the obvious way. Implications with only one consequence are obtained by creating one implication for each consequence, with the pre-condition of the original implication.

The resulting implications allow to apply Proposition 6.2. These inequalities of the form,  $p \geq 0$ , are then transformed into a set of *Diophantine constraints*, i.e. constraints without universally quantified variables, by requiring that all coefficients of  $p$  are non-negative. As proposed in [35], the resulting Diophantine constraints are then transformed into a SAT-problem. The constraints are then proven to have solutions by a SAT solver by inferring one possible solution.

## 6.4 Evaluation

We implemented the analysis introduced in the chapter, in our previous non-termination analyzer *pTNT*, which is written in SWI-Prolog [59] and can be downloaded from <http://www.cs.kuleuven.be/~dean/iclp2011.html>. We tested our analysis on a benchmark of 14 programs similar to those used in this chapter. These programs are also available online. To solve the resulting SAT-Problem, MiniSat [19] is used.

We experimented with different bit-sizes in the translation to SAT and different classes of functions for the *prem* functions in Proposition 6.2. As *conc* functions, the identity function was used. Table 6.1 shows the results for the considered settings,  $+$  denotes that non-termination is proven successfully,  $-$  denotes that



|           | linear-class, 3 bits | linear-class, 4 bits | max2-class, 3 bits | max2-class, 4 bits |
|-----------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| count_to  | +                    | +                    | +                  | +                  |
| constants | +                    | +                    | +                  | <i>OS</i>          |
| int1      | +                    | +                    | +                  | +                  |
| int2      | +                    | +                    | +                  | +                  |
| int3      | +                    | +                    | +                  | <i>OS</i>          |
| int4      | +                    | +                    | +                  | <i>OS</i>          |
| int5      | +                    | +                    | +                  | <i>OS</i>          |
| int6      | +                    | +                    | +                  | <i>OS</i>          |
| int7      | +                    | +                    | <i>OS</i>          | <i>OS</i>          |
| int8      | +                    | +                    | <i>OS</i>          | <i>OS</i>          |
| int9      | —                    | +                    | <i>OS</i>          | <i>OS</i>          |
| int10     | —                    | —                    | +                  | <i>OS</i>          |
| int11     | —                    | +                    | —                  | <i>OS</i>          |
| int12     | —                    | +                    | —                  | <i>OS</i>          |
| int13     | +                    | +                    | +                  | +                  |
| int14     | +                    | +                    | +                  | <i>OS</i>          |

Table 6.1: An overview of the experiments

non-termination could not be proven and *OS* denotes that the computation went out of stack. The considered settings are 3 and 4 as bit-sizes and *linear* and *max2* as forms for the symbolic *prem*-functions. The *linear* class is a weighted sum of each argument. The *max2* class contains a weighted term for each multiplication of two arguments. The analysis time is between 1 and 20 seconds for all programs and settings.

Table 6.1 shows non-termination can be proven for any program of the benchmark when choosing the right combination of parameters, but no setting succeeds in proving non-termination for all programs. Programs *int9* and *int12* require a constant that cannot be represented with bit-size 3. Linear *prem*-functions cannot prove non-termination for *int10*. However, the setting with 4 as a bit-size and *max2* as class of *prem*-function usually fails, because these settings cause an exponential increase in memory use during the translation to SAT.

From the experiments, we have learned that it could be useful to apply SMT solvers, instead of SAT solvers, to reduce the memory usage.

## 6.5 Summary

In this chapter, we introduced a technique to detect classes of non-terminating queries for logic programs with integer arithmetic. The analysis starts with a given program and class queries, specified using modes, and detects subclasses of non-terminating queries. First, the derivations for the given class of queries are abstracted by building a moded SLD-tree with additional transitions to handle integer arithmetic. Then, this moded SLD-tree is used to detect subclasses

of non-terminating queries in two phases. In the first phase, we ignore the conditions over integers, e.g.,  $> /2$ , and detect paths in the moded SLD-tree that correspond to infinite derivations if all conditions on integers in those derivations succeed. For every such path, the corresponding subclass of queries is generated. In the second phase, the obtained classes of queries are restricted to classes of non-terminating queries, by formulating constraints implying that all conditions on integers will succeed. These constraints are then solved by transforming them into a SAT problem.

We implemented this approach in our non-termination analyzer *pTNT* and evaluated it on small benchmark of non-terminating Prolog programs with integer arithmetic. The evaluation shows that the proposed technique is rather powerful, but also that the parameters in the transformation to SAT must be chosen carefully to avoid excessive memory use.

## Reference

The work in this chapter was presented at ICLP 2011 and is published in [56].

# Chapter 7

## Termination Analysis of CHR

This chapter presents an approach to termination analysis of Constraint Handling Rules (CHR). The presented analysis is the first termination condition for CHR without restrictions on the kind of rules in the CHR program. We propose a termination condition that verifies conditions imposed on the dynamic process of adding constraints to the store, instead of a termination argument based on the comparison of sizes of consecutive computation states. We demonstrate the condition's applicability on a set of terminating CHR programs, using a prototype analyzer. This analyzer is the first in-language automated termination analyzer for CHR programs.

### 7.1 Introduction

Constraint Handling Rules (CHR), created by Thom Frühwirth [20], is a relatively young member of the declarative programming languages family. It is a concurrent, committed-choice, logic programming language. CHR is constraint-based and has guarded rules that rewrite multisets of atomic formulas until they are solved. CHR defines three kinds of rules: *simplification* rules remove constraints and add new ones, *propagation* rules only add new constraints and *simplagation* rules are a combination of both. CHR's simple syntax and semantics make it well-suited for implementing custom constraint solvers [20, 47, 48]. Particularly the latter feature of the language accounts for its success and impact on the research community.

Due to its multi-headed rules, CHR provides extra declarative expressivity

compared to the single-headed rules of Logic Programming (LP). But at the same time, the operational behavior of multi-headed rules is more complex and harder to predict than that of single-headed ones. As a consequence, the importance of automated analysis tools, that assist a CHR-programmer to predict runtime properties of his/her programs is high. One of these properties is the termination of such programs.

Although the language is strongly related to LP, termination analysis of CHR programs has received little attention. Termination of CHR without propagation has been addressed before in [21] and [42]. The approach of [21] is based on adapting well-known LP termination techniques directly to CHR. The approach of [42] is based on a transformation of CHR into Prolog.

Because propagation rules only add constraints, a fire-once policy is used for these rules. A condition based on this fire-once policy is needed to prove termination for such programs. In this chapter we present a condition based on an interpretation of the constraints, such that propagation rules only add 'smaller' constraints and for other rules, the number of the 'largest' constraints decreases. Because of the fire-once policy, this condition implies termination. We implemented the method in a prototype analyzer and performed an experimental evaluation. The results were very satisfactory. Since the approach presented in [21] was not implemented, this analyzer is the first in-language automated termination analyzer for CHR.

The chapter is organized as follows. In the next section, we introduce the basic aspects of CHR and adapt some concepts from termination analysis of LP to the CHR context. In Section 7.3, we introduce a termination condition for general CHR programs that is sufficient for proving termination. Next, we further refine the condition so that it can be automated. In Section 7.4, we discuss our implementation and experimental evaluation. Finally, Section 7.5 summarizes the chapter.

## 7.2 Preliminaries

### 7.2.1 Constraint Handling Rules

**Syntax.** A *constraint* in CHR is a first-order predicate. We distinguish between *built-in constraints*, predefined and solved by the underlying constraint theory, CT, and *CHR constraints*, user-defined and solved by a *CHR program P*. A CHR program is a finite set of *CHR rules*. Rules are of the form:

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Simplification rule:</b>                         | <b>Propagation rule:</b>                            | <b>Simpagation rule:</b>                             |
| $true \setminus H \Leftrightarrow [G \parallel] B.$ | $H \setminus true \Leftrightarrow [G \parallel] B.$ | $H_1 \setminus H_2 \Leftrightarrow [G \parallel] B.$ |
| <b>or</b> $H \Leftrightarrow [G \parallel] B.$      | <b>or</b> $H \Rightarrow [G \parallel] B.$          |  |

The head  $H$  or  $H_1 \setminus H_2$  is a conjunction of CHR constraints. The optional guard  $G$  is a conjunction of built-in constraints. The body  $B$  is a conjunction of built-in and CHR constraints. Empty conjuncts are denoted by the built-in constraint *true*. As in Prolog syntax, conjuncts are separated by commas. Note that all rules can be written as simpagation rules.

**Example 7.1** (Fibonacci). *The CHR program below implements a Fibonacci algorithm. Natural numbers are written in the symbolic notation, using 0 and the successor functor  $s$ . In this program,  $add/3$  is a built-in constraint which defines addition on natural numbers written in symbolic notation.*

$$fib(N, M1), fib(N, M2) \Leftrightarrow M1 = M2, fib(N, M1).$$

$$fib(0, M) \Rightarrow M = s(0).$$

$$fib(s(0), M) \Rightarrow M = s(0).$$

$$fib(s(s(N)), M) \Rightarrow fib(s(N), M1), fib(N, M2), add(M1, M2, M).$$

*The first rule is a simplification rule that removes doubles. The other rules are propagation rules. Base cases are solved by the second and third rule. The last rule adds CHR constraints representing Fibonacci numbers and a built-in constraint relating their arguments.*  $\square$

**Operational Semantics.** A CHR program defines a state transition system, where a *state* is defined as a conjunction of CHR and built-in constraints, called the *constraint store*. The *initial state* or *query* is an arbitrary conjunction of constraints. Each state where either the built-in constraints are inconsistent (*failed state*), or no more transitions are possible, is called a *final state*.

**Definition 7.1** (Transition relation). *The **transition relation**,  $\mapsto$ , between states, given a constraint theory  $CT$  and a CHR program  $P$ , is defined as:*

$$\begin{aligned}
& H'_1 \wedge H'_2 \wedge D \mapsto (B \wedge H'_1 \wedge D)\theta\theta' \\
& \text{if } H_1 \setminus H_2 \Leftrightarrow G \mid B. \text{ in } P \text{ and } \theta, \theta' \text{ are substitutions such that} \\
& CT \models D \rightarrow (((H_1\theta \wedge H_2\theta) = (H'_1 \wedge H'_2)) \wedge G\theta\theta')
\end{aligned}$$

A CHR rule,  $H_1 \setminus H_2 \Leftrightarrow G \mid B$ , is applicable to a conjunction of CHR constraints,  $H' = H'_1 \wedge H'_2$ , if  $H'_1$  matches head  $H_1$  and  $H'_2$  matches head  $H_2$  with matching

substitution  $\theta$ , such that the guard  $G$  evaluates to true, with answer substitution  $\theta'$ , given the built-ins in the constraint store. The body  $B$  is a conjunction of built-in and CHR constraints.  $B\theta\theta'$  is added to the constraint store. Rule application is non-deterministic and committed-choice.  $\square$

For more information about the operational semantics of CHR, we refer to [20].

A CHR program  $P$  with query  $I$  *terminates*, if all computations for  $P$  with query  $I$  end in a final state. Because propagation rules do not remove constraints from the store, a fire-once policy is used to prevent trivial non-termination. This fire-once policy ensures that no propagation rule fires more than once on the same multi-set of constraints. The *propagation history* implements this policy. For a more detailed description of the propagation history, we refer to [3].

CHR has no fairness guarantees: constraints in the body of a rule might never be selected in a computation. This means that our technique will not be able to prove termination if termination depends on the evaluation of built-in constraints from the body.

In the following example, we discuss a computation for the Fibonacci program discussed earlier.

**Example 7.2** (Fibonacci continued). *With a typical query  $\text{fib}(s(s(s(0))), N)$ , the last propagation rule adds two new  $\text{fib}/2$  constraints to the store with lower first arguments. However, it does not remove the constraint that has fired the rule from the store. This propagation rule fires again on the added constraint  $\text{fib}(s(s(0)), N)$ , adding again two CHR constraints with a lower first argument to the store. The other two propagation rules resolve base cases, while the simplification rule removes duplicates. The constraint store:  $\text{fib}(s(s(s(0))), s(s(s(0)))) \wedge \text{fib}(s(s(0)), s(s(0))) \wedge \text{fib}(s(0), s(0)) \wedge \text{fib}(0, s(0))$  is the final state. Without the simplification rule the answer would contain an additional  $\text{fib}(s(0), s(0))$  constraint.*  $\square$

Observe that, given any reasonable way to measure the size of the constraint store, the size of the store increases for this program. This means that standard approaches for proving termination of LP, which prove decreases in size between consecutive computation states, are not easily and immediately applicable to CHR. One would need to explicitly add an encoding of the propagation history to the representation of the store to make this work. In this paper, we have chosen for a different type of termination condition for programs with propagation rules.

## 7.2.2 Termination Analysis

Termination analysis of logic programs has received a lot of attention (see for example [16]). In LP, consecutive computation states are compared using a *norm* and *level mapping*. A norm is a function which maps terms to natural numbers. A level mapping is a function which maps atoms to natural numbers. In this subsection we redefine some well-known concepts from LP to the CHR context.

We define  $Term_P$  as the set of all terms constructible from a program  $P$  and  $Con_P$  as the set of all constraints constructible from  $P$ , with arguments from  $Term_P$ .

**Definition 7.2** (norm, level mapping). A **norm** is a mapping  $\|\cdot\| : Term_P \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . A **level mapping** is a mapping  $|\cdot| : Con_P \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ .  $\square$

We refer to  $|C|$  as the *level value* of  $C$ . Several examples of norms and level mappings can be found in the literature on LP termination analysis [16]. Two well-known norms are *list-length* and *term-size*.

**Definition 7.3** (list-length, term-size).

**List-length** is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \|[t_1|t_2]\|_l &= 1 + \|t_2\|_l \\ \|t\|_l &= 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

with  $t_1, t_2$  and  $t$  any term.

**Term-size** is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n)\|_t &= 1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|t_i\|_t \\ \|t\|_t &= 0 \text{ otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

with  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  and  $t$  any term

$\square$

The most common kind of level mapping is the *linear level mapping*.

**Definition 7.4** (linear level mapping). A **linear level mapping** is any level mapping which can be defined as:  $|con(t_1, \dots, t_n)| = con_0 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} con_i \cdot \|t_i\|$ , with  $con_i \in \mathbb{N}$  only depending on the constraint symbol  $con$  and  $\|\cdot\|$  a norm.  $\square$

We also adapt the notion of rigidity to the CHR context.

**Definition 7.5** (Rigidity). A CHR constraint  $C$  is **rigid** w.r.t. a level mapping  $|\cdot|$  iff  $\forall$  substitutions  $\theta : |C| = |C\theta|$ .  $\square$

To prove termination, we need some information about the CHR constraints which can be added to the store during an execution of a program for a query. For this purpose, we define the *call set*.

**Definition 7.6** (Call Set). Given a program  $P$  and a query  $I$ , the **call set** for  $P$  with query  $I$ ,  $\mathbf{Call}(P, I)$ , is the union, over all possible computations of  $P$

for  $I$ , of all CHR-constraints which are added to the constraint store during that computation.

Usually,  $\text{Call}(P, I)$  is specified using an abstraction. In what follows we describe the call set using types.

### 7.3 A new termination condition for CHR

In [21], concepts and ideas from LP termination analysis are adapted to CHR with simplification only. Termination is proved by showing a decrease between the removed and the added constraints, for each CHR rule in the program.

The extension to programs with propagation rules gives a totally new termination problem. In LP or CHR without propagation, each rule removes one predicate, for LP, and at least one constraint, for CHR without propagation. Termination is proven by measuring a decrease of the goal, or of the constraint store, for each rule application. For CHR with propagation, this approach seems infeasible because new constraints are added and no existing constraints are removed. As mentioned before, one would need to keep track of information regarding the propagation history to observe a decrease. Instead of a termination argument based on a comparison of sizes of consecutive computation states, we formulate and verify conditions imposed on the dynamic process of adding constraints to the store. We formulate conditions which guarantee that the entire computation only adds a finite number of constraints to the store. Due to the use of a propagation history, this implies termination.

First we prove that if only a finite number of CHR constraints are added to the constraint store, program  $P$  with query  $I$  terminates. Note that, if the same constraint is added multiple times to the constraint store, then we consider these additions as different.

**Lemma 7.1** (Termination of a CHR program). *A CHR program  $P$  with query  $I$  terminates iff there are a finite number of additions of CHR constraints to the constraint store during any execution of  $P$  for  $I$ .*  $\square$

*Proof.*  $\implies$ : If  $P$  terminates for  $I$ , then for any execution of  $P$  for  $I$ , only a finite number of rules are applied. Therefore, only a finite number of CHR constraints are added to the store.

$\impliedby$ : Suppose there are only a finite number of CHR constraints added to the store during any execution of program  $P$  for  $I$ . Each propagation rule can only be fired a finite number of times because of the propagation history. Each simplification or simpagation rule removes at least one CHR constraint from



the store. Therefore, a simpagation or simplification rule can only be applied a finite number of times. Since every rule can only be applied a finite number of times,  $P$  terminates for  $I$ .  $\square$

### 7.3.1 Ranking Condition (RC) for CHR with substitutions

The next definition gives the first version of our Ranking Condition (RC). It is applicable to general CHR programs. Informally, a program satisfies the RC if each propagation rule only adds constraints which are smaller than the constraints in the head and each simplification or simpagation rule reduces the number of largest constraints in the rule.

**Definition 7.7** (Ranking condition for CHR with substitutions). *A program  $P$  and a query  $I$  satisfy the RC for CHR, w.r.t. level mapping  $|\cdot|$  iff every CHR constraint in  $\text{Call}(P, I)$  is rigid w.r.t.  $|\cdot|$  and for each rule in  $P$  and for every matching substitution  $\theta$  and answer substitution  $\theta'$  from Definition 7.1:*

1. *For a simplification or simpagation rule  $H \setminus H_1, \dots, H_n \Leftrightarrow G \mid B_1, \dots, B_m$ , with  $n > 0$  and body-CHR constraints  $B_k, \dots, B_m$ ,  
let  $p = \max \{|H_1\theta|, \dots, |H_n\theta|, |B_k\theta\theta'|, \dots, |B_m\theta\theta'|\}$ . Then,  
the number of CHR constraints with level value  $p$  is  
higher in  $\{H_1\theta, \dots, H_n\theta\}$  than in  $\{B_k\theta\theta', \dots, B_m\theta\theta'\}$*
2. *For a propagation rule:  $H_1, \dots, H_n \Rightarrow G \mid B_1, \dots, B_m$ , with body-CHR constraints  $B_k, \dots, B_m$ :  
for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $j = k, \dots, m$ :  $|H_i\theta| > |B_j\theta\theta'|$ .*  $\square$

Our condition on simplification and simpagation rules in Definition 7.7 is more strict than the corresponding ranking condition for such rules in [21]. The reason for this is that in the presence of propagation rules, a multiset order decrease, as in [21], is insufficient to guarantee termination.

**Example 7.3** (Counterexample multiset order decrease). *Consider the program:*

$$a(s(N)), a(N) \Leftrightarrow a(s(N)). \quad a(s(N)) \Rightarrow a(N).$$

*The program does not terminate for any query  $a(s(n))$ , with  $n$  any term. Our RC cannot be fulfilled for the simplification rule. However, using a level mapping  $|a(t)| = ||t||_t$  and a multiset order on conjunctions of constraints, as in [21], there is a decrease from head to body constraints for this rule. So a straightforward extension of the ranking condition of [21] is incorrect.*  $\square$

**Theorem 7.1** (Sufficiency of the RC with substitutions). *Let program  $P$  with query  $I$  satisfy the RC with substitutions w.r.t.  $|\cdot|$ , then all computations for  $P$  with query  $I$  terminate.*  $\square$

*Proof.* In order to prove termination of a CHR program  $P$  with a query  $I$ , Lemma 7.1 shows that it is sufficient to prove that the total number of CHR constraints, added during an execution of  $P$  for  $I$ , is finite. As a base of the induction, we show that there is a maximal level value for the CHR constraints in the store and that only a finite number of CHR constraints with that level mapping can be added to the store. Using induction we prove that for each level value only a finite number of CHR constraints can enter the store.

Before we present the induction proof, first note that because of the rigidity of  $Call(P, I)$  under  $|\cdot|$ , the level value of a constraint that matches the head of a rule cannot change anymore due to instantiations caused by answer substitutions of guards or built-in body constraints. So, level values of constraints in the store are static: the level values cannot change over time.

**Base case.** Let  $max$  be the maximal level value of the constraints in  $I$ . Propagation rules only add constraints with a lower level value than  $max$ . Because of the RC, simplification or simpagation rules only add constraints with a level value smaller than or equal to the largest level value of the constraints matching the head of the rule. Every time a CHR constraint of level value  $max$  is added by such a rule, the number of CHR constraints with level value  $max$  decreases. So only a finite number  $a_{max}$  of CHR constraints with level value  $max$  are added to the store during any execution of  $P$  for  $I$ .

**Induction step.** Let  $a_{max}, \dots, a_{n+1}$  be upper limits for the number of CHR constraints with level value  $max, \dots, n+1$ , w.r.t.  $|\cdot|$ , which can be added to the constraint store during an execution of  $P$  with query  $I$ .

- $I$  only contains a finite number of constraints with level value  $n$ .
- If an instance of a propagation rule adds a CHR constraint with level value  $n$  to the store, the CHR constraints matching the head all have a level value larger than  $n$ . Because of the upper limits  $a_{max}, \dots, a_{n+1}$  and the propagation history, every propagation rule can only add a finite number of CHR constraints with level value  $n$ .
- For every instance of a simplification or simpagation rule which adds a CHR constraint with level value  $n$  to the store, there exists an  $i$ ,  $i : n \leq i \leq max$ , such that the number of CHR constraints of level value  $i$  decreases, and no constraint with a level value higher than  $i$  is added to the store by this simplification or simpagation rule. This implies that only a finite number of constraints with level mapping  $n$  can enter the store by

simpagation or simplification rules, because after enough rule executions, there are no CHR constraints with a level value  $n$  or higher left.

**By induction,** this proves that only a finite number of CHR constraints are added to the store. Therefore, Lemma 7.1 proves termination.  $\square$

**Example 7.4** (Fibonacci continued). *We prove termination for the Fibonacci example with the RC with substitutions.*

Let  $\text{fib}(n, m)$  be any query, with  $n$  a ground term, representing a natural number in successor-notation and  $m$  a free variable. One can infer that the call set is the set  $\{\text{fib}(n_1, m), \text{fib}(n_2, n_3) \mid n_1, n_2, n_3 \text{ ground terms, representing natural numbers and } m \text{ a free variable}\}$ . As a norm, we use term-size. The level mapping is defined as  $|\text{fib}(n, m)| = \|n\|_t$ . Clearly, the call set is rigid w.r.t.  $|\cdot|$ .

For the first rule, we have that for every matching substitution  $\theta$ , the first term in every  $\text{fib}/2$  constraint is substituted by the same ground term. The answer substitutions  $\theta'$  are the identity substitutions because this rule has no guard:

$$|\text{fib}(N, M1)\theta| = |\text{fib}(N, M2)\theta| = |\text{fib}(N, M1)\theta\theta'| = \|N\theta\theta'\|_t$$

All constraints have the same level value. There are two constraints in the head and one in the body, so this rule satisfies the RC with substitutions.

For the fourth rule we have that for every matching substitution  $\theta$ , the term matching  $s(s(N))$  is a ground term. The answer substitutions  $\theta'$  are empty, because the rule has no guard. For all matching and answer substitutions:

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{fib}(s(s(N)), M)\theta| &= 2 + \|N\theta\|_t > |\text{fib}(s(N), M1)\theta\theta'| = 1 + \|N\theta\theta'\|_t \\ |\text{fib}(s(s(N)), M)\theta| &= 2 + \|N\theta\|_t > |\text{fib}(N, M2)\theta\theta'| = \|N\theta\theta'\|_t \end{aligned}$$

The RC with substitutions is therefore satisfied, which implies termination for the considered queries.  $\square$

### 7.3.2 Ranking Condition for CHR

A disadvantage of the ranking condition of Definition 7.7, is that one has to consider all matching and answer substitutions. This cannot be done automatically because in general there can be infinitely many of such substitutions. In this section, we present a RC which is more suitable for automation. In order to estimate the effects of the matching substitutions, *abstract norms* and *abstract level mappings* are adapted from [18] and [35].

These functions map a variable to itself, instead of to zero. In order to estimate the effects of the answer substitutions, *interargument relations* are used.

Let  $\mathbb{N}[Var_P]$  denote the set of polynomials over  $Var_P$ , with natural coefficients.

**Definition 7.8** (abstract norm, abstract level mapping). *An **abstract norm** is a mapping  $||.|| : Term_P \rightarrow \mathbb{N}[Var_P]$ , which is the identity function on  $Var_P$ . An **abstract level mapping** is a mapping  $|\cdot| : Con_P \rightarrow \mathbb{N}[Var_P]$ .*  $\square$

Abstract list-length, abstract term-size and abstract linear level mappings are the obvious adaptations of Definitions 7.3 and Definition 7.4.

**Example 7.5** (Abstract linear level mappings). *Let  $L, List, N$  and  $M$  be variables. Typical examples of abstract linear level mappings are:*

$$\begin{aligned} |mergesort([L|List])|^\alpha &= 0 + 1. ||[L|List]||_t^\alpha &= 1 + List \\ |fib(s(s(N)), M)|^\alpha &= 0 + 1. ||s(s(N))||_t^\alpha + 0. ||M||_t^\alpha &= 2 + N \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

In general, an abstract level mapping maps constraints to arbitrary polynomials over  $\mathbb{N}$ . In order to compare the level values of the constraints w.r.t. an abstract level mapping, we define an ordering on polynomials over  $\mathbb{N}$  [35].

**Definition 7.9** (orderings on  $\mathbb{N}[Var_P]$ ). *Let  $p$  and  $q$  be two polynomials with  $n$  variables. The quasi-ordering  $\succeq$  is defined as  $p \succeq q$  iff  $p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \geq q(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  for all  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{N}$ . The strict ordering  $\succ$  is defined as  $p \succ q$  iff if  $p(x_1, \dots, x_n) > q(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  for all  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{N}$ . The equality between polynomials is defined as  $p \approx q$  iff  $p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = q(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  for all  $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{N}$ .*  $\square$

The next example shows the orderings between three polynomials.

**Example 7.6** (polynomial ordering).

*Let  $p(X, Y) = 1 + XY + 2X$ ,  $q(X) = 2X$  and  $z(X, Y) = XY + X$ :*

- $p(X, Y) \succ q(X)$ ,  $p(X, Y) \succ z(X, Y)$ .
- Neither  $q(X) \succeq z(X, Y)$  nor  $z(X, Y) \succeq q(X)$ .

$\square$

As stated, interargument relations are used to estimate the effect of the answer substitutions from Definition 7.1.

**Definition 7.10** (Interargument relation). *Let  $P$  be a program and  $p/n$  a built-in constraint in  $P$ . An **interargument relation** for  $p/n$  is a relation  $R_p \in \mathbb{N}^n$ .  $R_p$  is a valid interargument relation for  $p/n$  w.r.t. a norm  $||.||$ , iff*

$\forall t_1, \dots, t_n \in \text{Term}_P : CT \models p(t_1, \dots, t_n) \implies (||t_1||, \dots, ||t_n||) \in R_p.$   $\square$

We illustrate this with some small examples.

**Example 7.7** (Interargument relations).

| <i>built-in constraint</i>  | <i>norm and interargument relation</i>   |           |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------|
| $\text{delete}(N1, N2, N3)$ | $\text{list-length: } \{(n_1, n_2, n_3) \in \mathbb{N}^3 \mid n_1 \geq n_3\}$    |           |
| $\text{append}(N1, N2, N3)$ | $\text{list-length: } \{(n_1, n_2, n_3) \in \mathbb{N}^3 \mid n_1 + n_2 = n_3\}$ |           |
| $\text{leq}(N1, N2)$        | $\text{term-size: } \{(n_1, n_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mid n_1 \leq n_2\}$           | $\square$ |

We define rigidity for abstract level mappings.

**Definition 7.11** (Rigidity). *A CHR constraint  $C$  is **rigid** w.r.t. an abstract level mapping  $|\cdot|^\alpha$  iff  $\forall$  substitutions  $\theta : |C|^\alpha \approx |C\theta|^\alpha$ .*  $\square$

For an instance of a simplification or simpagation rule, the maximal level value is used in our RC with substitutions from Definition 7.7. Because the maximum is not defined for a set of polynomials, we introduce a  $\succeq$ -maximal subset of constraints.

**Definition 7.12** ( $\succeq$ -maximal subset of constraints). *Let  $C$  be a multiset of CHR constraints and  $|\cdot|^\alpha$  an abstract level mapping.  $D$  is a  $\succeq$ -**maximal subset** of  $C$  w.r.t.  $|\cdot|^\alpha$  iff  $D$  is a non-empty multi-subset of  $C$  such that:*

- *The constraints in  $D$  have the same level value:*  
 $\forall \text{ CHR-constraints } C1, C2 \in D : |C1|^\alpha \approx |C2|^\alpha$
- *There are no  $|\cdot|^\alpha$ -larger constraints in  $C \setminus D$ :*  
 $\neg(\exists C1 \in D, \exists C2 \in C \setminus D : |C2|^\alpha \succeq |C1|^\alpha)$   $\square$

Note that a multiset  $C$  may have several  $\succeq$ -maximal subsets.

We now reformulate our ranking condition from Definition 7.7, using abstract level mappings and interargument relations.

**Definition 7.13** (Ranking condition for CHR).

*A program  $P$  and a query  $I$  satisfy the RC for CHR, w.r.t. an abstract level mapping  $|\cdot|^\alpha$  and a set of interargument relations iff every constraint in  $\text{Call}(P, I)$  is rigid w.r.t.  $|\cdot|^\alpha$  and for each rule in  $P$  and for each substitution  $\sigma$  such that the built-in constraints in the guard all satisfy their associated interargument relations:*

1. *For a simplification or simpagation rule  $H \setminus H_1, \dots, H_n \Leftrightarrow G \mid B_1, \dots, B_m$ , with  $n > 0$ , body-CHR constraints  $B_k, \dots, B_m$  and  $D_1, \dots, D_c$  all  $\succeq$ -maximal*

subsets of  $\{H_1, \dots, H_n, B_k\sigma, \dots, B_m\sigma\}$ , then

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, c\} : \text{let } D_i = \{H_{i_1}, \dots, H_{i_p}, B_{i_1}\sigma, \dots, B_{i_q}\sigma\} : \\ \# \{H_{i_1}, \dots, H_{i_p}\} > \# \{B_{i_1}\sigma, \dots, B_{i_q}\sigma\}$$

2. For a propagation rule:  $H_1, \dots, H_n \Rightarrow G \mid B_1, \dots, B_m$ , with body-CHR constraints  $B_k, \dots, B_m$ :

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \forall j \in \{k, \dots, m\} : |H_i|^\alpha \succ |B_j\sigma|^\alpha. \quad \square$$

Observe that we still have substitutions in the formulation of this condition. But, we can avoid reasoning about them explicitly in an automation. It is enough to reason about all instances that satisfy the interargument relations.

**Theorem 7.2** (Sufficiency of the RC). *Let program  $P$  with query  $I$  satisfy the RC for CHR w.r.t.  $|\cdot|^\alpha$  and some associated interargument relations for all built-in constraints in the program, then all computations for  $P$  with query  $I$  terminate.*  $\square$

*Proof.* In order to prove termination of a CHR program  $P$  with a query  $I$ , it is sufficient to prove that the total number of CHR constraints, added during an execution of  $P$  with query  $I$ , is finite. We will prove this using induction.

Since the call set is rigid w.r.t. the level mapping  $|\cdot|^\alpha$ , for each CHR constraint  $C$ , which is added to the constraint store by the query or an instance of a rule,  $|C|^\alpha$  is a natural number.

**Base case.** The query is rigid w.r.t.  $|\cdot|^\alpha$ , so there exists a maximal level value of the CHR constraints in the query,  $max$ . Because of the ranking condition, each instance of a propagation rule can only add constraints with a level value lower than  $max$  and each simplification or simpagation rule can only add CHR constraints with a level value  $max$  or lower to the store.

If program  $P$  with query  $I$  satisfies the RC for CHR with  $|\cdot|^\alpha$ , all CHR constraints which are added to the store during any computation of  $P$  with query  $I$  have a natural number as level value w.r.t.  $|\cdot|^\alpha$  and there is a maximal level value  $max$ . Every time a CHR constraint of level value  $max$  is added by such a rule, the number of CHR constraints with level value  $max$  decreases. So only a finite number  $a_{max}$  of CHR constraints with level value  $max$  are added to the store during any execution of  $P$  for  $I$ .

**Induction step.** Let  $a_{max}, \dots, a_{n+1}$  be upper limits for the number of CHR constraints with level value  $max, \dots, n+1$  which can be added to the constraint store during an execution of  $P$  with query  $I$ .

- The query only contains a finite number of constraints with level value  $n$ .
- For each propagation rule which satisfies the RC w.r.t.  $|\cdot|^\alpha$ , every head constraint has a larger level value, w.r.t.  $\succ$ , than every CHR constraint in the body.

If an instance of a propagation rule adds a CHR constraint with level value  $n$  to the store, the CHR constraints matching the head all have a natural number larger than  $n$  as a level mapping. Because of the upper limits  $a_{max}, \dots, a_{n+1}$  and the propagation history, every propagation rule can only add a finite number of CHR constraints with level value  $n$ .

- For each simplification or simpagation rule which satisfies the RC w.r.t.  $|\cdot|^\alpha$ , every maximal subset of CHR constraints has more constraints from the head than from body of the rule. For every instance of a simplification or simpagation rule with maximal subsets  $D_1, \dots, D_n$ , there are maximally ranked subsets  $D_{i_1}, \dots, D_{i_p}$ , which contain the CHR constraints with the highest level value,  $m$ , w.r.t.  $|\cdot|^\alpha$ . Since the program satisfies the RC for CHR, the number of CHR constraints with level value  $m$  decreases and all CHR constraints added by the body of the rule have a level mapping smaller than or equal to  $m$ . This implies that only a finite number of constraints with level mapping  $n$  can be added to the store by instances of simpagation and simplification rules, because after enough rule executions, the constraint store has no CHR constraints with a level value  $n$  or higher left.

**By induction,** this proves that only a finite number of CHR constraints are added to the store. Therefore, Lemma 7.1 proves termination.  $\square$

We prove termination for the Fibonacci program with this RC.

**Example 7.8.** *As in Example 7.4, the query is  $fib(n, m)$  with  $n$  a ground term, representing a natural number in successor-notation and  $m$  a free variable. The call set is  $\{fib(n_1, m), fib(n_2, n_3) \mid n_1, n_2, n_3 \text{ ground terms, representing natural numbers and } m \text{ a free variable}\}$ . We use the abstract level mapping:  $|fib(n, m)|^\alpha = ||n||_t^\alpha$ .*

*The call set is rigid w.r.t. the chosen abstract level mapping. For the first rule,  $\{fib(N, M1), fib(N, M2), fib(N, M1)\}$  is a  $\succeq$ -maximal subset w.r.t.  $|\cdot|^\alpha$ . With two of these constraints in the head of the rule and only one in the body, this rule satisfies the RC for CHR. The second and third rule trivially satisfy the RC for CHR because they have no CHR constraints in the body. The last rule is a propagation rule. To satisfy the RC for CHR, every constraint matching*

the head of the rule must be larger than every constraint added by the body of the rule.

$$|fib(s(s(N)), M)|^\alpha = 2 + N \succ |fib(s(N), M1)|^\alpha = 1 + N$$

$$|fib(s(s(N)), M)|^\alpha = 2 + N \succ |fib(N, M2)|^\alpha = N. \quad \square$$

Because no interargument relations are needed for the Fibonacci example, another small example is given.

**Example 7.9** (Greatest common divisor - gcd). *We prove termination for gcd with the RC for CHR. This program calculates the greatest common divisor of a set of positive integer numbers for a query:  $gcd(n)$  ( $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ).*

$$gcd(0) \Leftrightarrow true.$$

$$gcd(M) \setminus gcd(N) \Leftrightarrow N \geq M, M > 0, nn \text{ is } N - M \mid gcd(NN).$$

The call set is  $\{gcd(n) \mid n \text{ a natural number}\}$ . As an abstract norm, we map each natural number or variable to itself. The associated interargument relations for the guard of the second rule are obvious (e.g.  $\{(n, m) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mid n \geq m\}$  for  $N \geq M$ ). For any instance  $gcd(m) \setminus gcd(n) \Leftrightarrow n \geq m, m > 0, nn \text{ is } n - m \mid gcd(nn)$ . satisfying the interargument relations of the guard, we have  $n > nn$ .

The abstract level mapping  $|gcd(n)|^\alpha = n$ , proves termination w.r.t. the associated interargument relations and the chosen norm.

The call set is rigid w.r.t. the abstract level mapping. Because the first rule has no CHR constraints in the body, it trivially satisfies the RC with  $\{gcd(0)\}$  as a  $\succeq$ -maximal subset. The second rule replaces a constraint  $gcd(n)$ , mapped to  $n$ , by the constraint  $gcd(nn)$ , mapped to  $nn$ . Since the associated interargument relations for this rule need to be satisfied:  $n > nn$ . Therefore,  $\{gcd(N)\}$  is the only  $\succeq$ -maximal subset of the rule. Since both rules satisfy the RC, this program terminates for the considered queries.  $\square$

## 7.4 Automation and experimental evaluation

We have implemented a prototype analyzer to allow us to experimentally evaluate our approach. The prototype is implemented in CHR, with SWI-Prolog as host-language. Space restrictions do not allow us to give a full account of the system. In this section, we focus on the most central components only and illustrate the general strategy with an example.



**Example 7.10** (Employee availability). *This program computes a list of all employees who have no appointment on a certain time point.*

$$\begin{aligned} &app(Tb, Te, E), empl(L), time(T) \Rightarrow member(E, L), Tb \leq T, T \leq Te \mid \\ &remove(E). \\ &empl(L_1), remove(E) \Leftrightarrow select(E, L_1, L_2) \mid empl(L_2). \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $select(e, l_1, l_2)$  only succeeds if the list  $l_1$  contains  $e$  and  $l_2$  is the list obtained from  $l_1$  by removing one occurrence of  $e$ .

The intention is that a query consists of constraints  $app/3$ , with a begin time, end time and employee's name, representing appointments, a constraint  $empl/1$ , with as only argument the list of all employee's names and a constraint  $time/1$ , with as its argument the time point on which we want the list of available employees. The propagation rule determines which employees need to be removed from the list. The simplification rule deletes employees from the list. The program terminates for all considered queries.  $\square$

To prove termination of a CHR program with the RC for CHR, one has to find a norm, associated interargument relations and an appropriate abstract level mapping, such that the RC is satisfied. We use abstract linear level mappings. In the philosophy of the constraint based approach to termination analysis, as described in [18], we introduce a symbolic form of the level mapping.

**Example 7.11** (Employee availability continued). *For the constraints in employee availability we have the symbolic forms:*  $|time(t)|^\alpha = time_0 + time_1 \cdot ||t||^\alpha$ ,  
 $|app(t_b, t_e, e)|^\alpha = app_0 + app_1 \cdot ||t_b||^\alpha + app_2 \cdot ||t_e||^\alpha + app_3 \cdot ||e||^\alpha$ ,  
 $|empl(e)|^\alpha = empl_0 + empl_1 \cdot ||e||^\alpha$ ,  
 $|remove(e)|^\alpha = remove_0 + remove_1 \cdot ||e||^\alpha$ .  $\square$

Following the constraint based approach, the aim is to translate the conditions imposed by the RC into constraints of the symbolic coefficients (e.g.  $app_0, app_1, app_2, app_3$ ) of the level mapping. This translation must be such that every solution for the resulting constraints corresponds to one way of satisfying the RC, and therefore, of obtaining a termination proof.

First, we perform a simple type inference to compute an overestimation of the call set. It is based on four basic types: *ground list*, *nil-terminated list*, *ground term* and *any term*. We initialize the call set with the given query type. Until a fix point is reached, constraints from the call set are matched with each rule's head. For every applicable rule, the effect of the guard is analyzed and the call types of the CHR body constraints are added to the call set.

**Example 7.12** (Employee availability continued). *We initialize the call set as the set of all typed constraints in the query:  $Call = \{app(t_1, t_2, e), empl(l), time(t_3) \mid t_1, t_2, t_3, e \text{ ground terms and } l \text{ a ground list}\}$ . Only the first rule adds a new typed constraint, namely  $remove(e)$  with  $e$  a ground term. The fix point is reached and the call set is  $Call \cup \{remove(e) \mid e \text{ a ground term}\}$ .*  $\square$

Next, we choose between term-size and list-length as the norm. The call set can provide us with information on how to select between them. But, the choice is backtrackable.

**Example 7.13** (Employee availability continued). *Due to the groundness of all terms in the call set, we first select term-size. It turns out that the analyzer fails for this choice. We then set the norm to list-length.*  $\square$

Now, we impose rigidity of the level mapping on the call set. We also ensure that the level mapping only measures arguments of the appropriate type.

**Example 7.14** (Employee availability continued). *The constraints  $app/3$ ,  $time/1$  and  $remove/1$  have no list-arguments. Thus, we measure no arguments:*

$$|app(t_b, t_e, e)|^\alpha = app_0 \quad |time(t)|^\alpha = time_0 \quad |remove(e)|^\alpha = remove_0$$

*The only argument of  $empl/1$  is a ground list, so  $|empl(l)|^\alpha = empl_0 + empl_1 \cdot ||l||_l^\alpha$  is rigid on the call set.*  $\square$

In a next step, interargument relations are inferred for the guards. Our prototype implementation contains predefined interargument relations under list-length and term-size for built-in predicates. It requires the user to provide interargument relations for other guards. This can easily be further automated in the future by using interargument relation inference from another analyzer (e.g. Polytool [35]).

**Example 7.15** (Employee availability continued). *For  $member/2$  and  $=/2$  there are no 'real' interargument relations under list-length, so that the relations are  $\mathbb{N}^2$ . For  $select/3$ , the associated interargument relation is  $\{(n_1, n_2, n_3) \in \mathbb{N}^3 \mid n_2 = n_3 + 1\}$ .*  $\square$

We then reach the most central part of the system. Here, we set up constraints on the remaining symbolic coefficients of the level mapping, corresponding to the conditions expressed in the RC.

For propagation rules, this is fairly easy: provided that interargument relations hold of the guards, the level mapping should decrease from head to body constraints.

| possible $\succeq$ -maximal subsets   | Resulting set of equations   |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| $\{empl(L)\}$                         | $ empl(L_1) ^\alpha \succ  empl(L_2) ^\alpha \wedge  empl(L_1) ^\alpha \succ  remove(E) ^\alpha$   |
| $\{remove(E)\}$                       | $ remove(E) ^\alpha \succ  empl(L_1) ^\alpha \wedge  remove(E) ^\alpha \succ  empl(L_2) ^\alpha$   |
| $\{empl(L_1)\}, \{remove(E)\}$        | $( remove(E) ^\alpha \succ  empl(L_2) ^\alpha \vee  empl(L_1) ^\alpha \succ  empl(L_2) ^\alpha) \\ \wedge \neg( empl(L_1) ^\alpha \succeq  remove(E) ^\alpha) \\ \wedge \neg( remove(E) ^\alpha \succeq  empl(L_1) ^\alpha)$ |
| $\{empl(L_1), remove(E)\}$            | $ empl(L_1) ^\alpha \succ  empl(L_2) ^\alpha \wedge  empl(L_1) ^\alpha \approx  remove(E) ^\alpha$   |
| $\{empl(L_1), remove(E), empl(L_2)\}$ | $ empl(L_1) ^\alpha \approx  empl(L_2) ^\alpha \wedge  empl(L_1) ^\alpha \approx  remove(E) ^\alpha$   |

Table 7.1:  $\succeq$ -maximal subsets for employee availability

**Example 7.16** (Employee availability continued). *For the propagation rule, since the interargument relations for the guard are trivial, we get:*

$$\begin{array}{llll}
|app(T_b, T_e, E)|^\alpha & \succ & |remove(E)|^\alpha & app_0 \succ remove_0 \\
|time(T)|^\alpha & \succ & |remove(E)|^\alpha & or \quad time_0 \succ remove_0 \\
|empl(L_1)|^\alpha & \succ & |remove(E)|^\alpha & empl_0 + empl_1.L_1 \succ remove_0 \quad (1)
\end{array}$$

□

For simplification and simpagation rules this step is more difficult. The problem is that we need to reason about  $\succeq$ -maximal subsets of constraints but that these subsets depend on the used level mapping – which, as yet, has not been fixed.

To solve this, we will compute all the possibilities of candidate  $\succeq$ -maximal subsets, which are such that the condition in the RC is fulfilled. For each of these possibilities, we then express what conditions on the level mapping are required to make these subsets the  $\succeq$ -maximal ones. If any of these conditions on the level mapping can be satisfied, the RC holds for the rule.

**Example 7.17** (Employee availability continued). *In the first column of Table 1, we present all the different cases of possible  $\succeq$ -maximal subsets for the simplification rule, which are such that the RC is fulfilled. The second column of the table contains the corresponding condition on the level mapping needed for  $\succeq$ -maximality of these sets.*

*Observe that for the four last rows, the resulting equations are inconsistent with the constraint (1) obtained for the propagation rule. For instance, for the second row,  $|remove(E)|^\alpha \succ |empl(L_1)|^\alpha$  is inconsistent with  $|empl(L_1)|^\alpha \succ |remove(E)|^\alpha$ .*

*As a result, the first row is the only remaining candidate constraint. Since the interargument relation of the guard in the simplification rule is non-trivial, we obtain the condition:*

$$\begin{aligned}
L_1 = L_2 + 1 &\implies |empl(L_1)|^\alpha \succ |empl(L_2)|^\alpha \wedge |empl(L_1)|^\alpha \succ |remove(E)|^\alpha \\
\text{or } L_1 = L_2 + 1 &\implies empl_0 + empl_1.L_1 \succ empl_0.L_2 + empl_1.L_2 \wedge \\
&empl_0 + empl_1.L_1 \succ remove_0
\end{aligned}
\quad \square$$

Finally, all conditions on the symbolic coefficients are collected and transformed into Diophantine constraints, by using the method described in [35]. These equations are solved using the constraint solver of AProVE ([23]).

**Example 7.18** (Employee availability continued).

*AProVE finds the solution  $app_0 = empl_0 = time_0 = empl_1 = 1$ ,  $remove_0 = 0$ , corresponding to the level mapping:*

$$\begin{array}{ll}
|app(Tb, Te, E)|^\alpha = 1 & |empl(L)|^\alpha = 1 + ||L||_l^\alpha \\
|remove(E)|^\alpha = 0 & |time(T)|^\alpha = 1
\end{array}
\quad \square$$

## 7.4.1 Experimental evaluation

There are some benchmarks available in the CHR community. Because they are aimed at testing performance issues, they are relatively small and not useful for testing a termination analyzer. Therefore, we collected a number of programs from various sources to set up a new benchmark. It contains 52 programs: 39 without propagation and 13 with propagation. All programs are terminating.

We compared our prototype analyzer with the transformational analyzer of [42], which cannot deal with propagation. The results are very satisfactory. Our analyzer proves termination for 31 programs without propagation. The analyzer of [42] proves termination of 26 of these programs. The transformational analyzer proves termination of two programs where our approach fails. This is because these programs need a more complex norm as list-length or term-size. The results are presented in Tables 7.2 and 7.3. The upper half of the tables are programs from [42]. The lower part are programs from webCHR<sup>1</sup> except for employee, which is the employee availability example from Section 4. **Imp** gives the results of our prototype implementation. [42] gives the results of the transformational approach in [42].

Our implementation proves 10 programs with propagation from the benchmark terminating. The failing programs increase an arguments size till a certain bound. Our approach cannot deal with bounded increases. For term rewrite systems, a technique to prove termination for such programs is discussed in [24].

---

<sup>1</sup><http://chr.informatik.uni-ulm.de/webchr/>

| Name      | Imp | [42] | Name                         | Imp | [42] |
|-----------|-----|------|------------------------------|-----|------|
| ackermann | -   | -    | modulo                       | +   | +    |
| average   | +   | +    | oddeven                      | +   | +    |
| binlog    | +   | +    | pathcons                     | -   | +    |
| booland   | +   | +    | power                        | +   | +    |
| boolcard  | +   | +    | revlist                      | +   | +    |
| concat    | -   | -    | som                          | +   | +    |
| convert   | +   | -    | toyama                       | -   | +    |
| diff      | +   | +    | weight                       | +   | -    |
| factorial | +   | +    | bool and <sub>tr</sub>       | +   | +    |
| gcd       | +   | +    | even <sub>tr</sub>           | +   | +    |
| genint1   | +   | +    | fib tabulation <sub>tr</sub> | +   | -    |
| joinlists | +   | +    | fibonacci <sub>tr</sub>      | +   | -    |
| max       | +   | +    | genint <sub>tr</sub>         | -   | -    |
| mean      | +   | +    | primes <sub>tr</sub>         | +   | -    |
| mergesort | +   | +    |                              |     |      |
| dfsearch  | +   | +    | primes3                      | -   | -    |
| lex       | +   | +    | succ add                     | +   | +    |
| min       | +   | +    | sudoku                       | -   | -    |
| nqueen2   | +   | -    | tak                          | -   | -    |
| primes2   | +   | +    | zebra                        | +   | -    |

Table 7.2: Result for programs without propagation

| Name            | Imp |
|-----------------|-----|
| boolean and     | +   |
| even            | +   |
| fib tabulation  | +   |
| fibonacci       | +   |
| genint          | -   |
| primes          | +   |
| employee        | +   |
| autogen booland | +   |
| family          | +   |
| fib bottomup    | -   |
| fib top down    | +   |
| primes1         | +   |
| sorting         | -   |

Table 7.3: Programs for programs with propagation

## 7.5 Summary

We discussed a new approach to termination analysis of CHR programs. Before 2008, automated termination analysis was restricted to CHR programs with simplification only. Our condition allows for termination analysis of general CHR programs, that is, CHR programs with propagation as well. We have implemented the technique in an automated system. Experimental results with this system show that it is successful in proving termination for a majority of the test set programs.

The condition on simplification rules, as proposed in [21], was strengthened in our RC in order to be able to extend it with a condition for propagation rules. Therefore, a small class of CHR programs cannot be proved terminating with our approach, where the (non-automated) approach of [21] succeeds.

### 7.5.1 Later works on Termination analysis of CHR

After the publication of the work described in this chapter, P. Pilozzi introduced a new ranking condition for CHR with propagation in [39]. The analysis of [39] allows to combine our ranking condition for propagation rules with multiset decreases for simplification rules as in [21]. The resulting analysis is strictly stronger than both the termination condition of [21] and the termination condition described in this chapter.

Further improvements on termination analysis of CHR were published in [40] and [41].

## Reference

The work in this chapter was presented at LOPSTR 2008 and is published in [57].

## Chapter 8

# Conclusion

Chapter 3 presented an approximation framework for attacking the undecidable termination problem of logic programs, as an alternative to current termination/non-termination proof approaches. We introduced an idea of termination prediction, established a necessary and sufficient characterization of infinite SLDNF-derivations with arbitrary (concrete or moded) queries, built a new loop checking mechanism, and developed an algorithm that predicts termination of general logic programs with arbitrary queries. We implemented the analysis and demonstrated the effectiveness of the termination prediction with representative examples including ones borrowed from the Termination Competition 2007.

Chapter 4 introduced a new approach to non-termination analysis of logic programs based on the symbolic derivation tree for a moded query defined in Chapter 3. This symbolic derivation tree represents the derivations of all concrete queries denoted by the moded query. We introduced a non-termination condition that identifies paths in this tree that can be repeated infinitely. We implemented the approach and evaluated it on a benchmark of 48 non-terminating programs from the termination competition of 2007. Our tool, *P2P*, proves non-termination of all benchmark programs. We have shown that our technique improves on the results of the only non-termination analyzer developed before our work, *NTI*, and that we can handle 2 new classes of programs.

In Chapter 5, we identified classes of logic programs for which previous analyzers fail to prove non-termination and we extended our non-termination analysis to overcome these limitations. The most important class of programs for which previous analyzers fail, are programs for which no fixed sequence of clauses

can be repeated infinitely. We have shown that non-failure information [17] can be used to abstract away from the exact sequence of clauses needed to solve non-failing goals. To use this non-failure information, type information is added to the symbolic derivation tree and a special transition is introduced to solve non-failing atoms. We have shown that program specialization [26] can be used to overcome another limitation of previous analyzers. If non-termination can not be proven due to aliased variables, redundant argument filtering may remove these duplicated variables from the program. Specialization can also be used in combination with the *NFG* transition. Program specialization may produce more instantiated clauses, giving a better approximation of the possible values after solving the non-failing goal.

In Chapter 6, we took a first step towards the analysis of real life Prolog programs by extending our non-termination analysis for logic programs with integer arithmetic. The analysis starts with a given program and class queries, specified using modes, and detects subclasses of non-terminating queries. First, the derivations for the given class of queries are abstracted by building a symbolic derivation tree with transitions to handle integer arithmetic. Then, this symbolic derivation tree is used to detect subclasses of non-terminating queries in two phases. The first phase focuses on the logic part of the computation and assumes the conditions over integers, e.g.  $> /2$ , succeed. It detects classes of queries that are non-terminating if all conditions on integers in those derivations succeed. The second phase of the analysis adds constraints over the integer arguments of the query to obtain a class of non-terminating queries. These constraints guarantee that all conditions on integers in the derivation will succeed. The constraints are then solved by transforming them into a SAT problem.

Chapter 7 introduced a termination analysis approach for Constraint Handling Rules, a constraint based programming language. Before 2008, automated termination analysis was restricted to CHR programs with simplification only. Our condition allows for termination analysis of general CHR programs, that is, CHR programs with propagation as well. We have implemented the technique in an automated system. Experimental results with this system show that it is successful in proving termination for a majority of the benchmark programs.

## 8.1 Symbolic execution

To finish the conclusion, we will situate our work in the broader context of symbolic execution [13]. Symbolic execution entails different analyses that use symbolic values instead of concrete inputs to test program properties. Program paths can then be explored by keeping a symbolic state which can identify



concrete inputs for which the path is applicable. Applications of symbolic execution include test input generation, error detection such as detection of uncaught exceptions but also more complex analyses such as security testing.

This description fits our work on termination prediction and non-termination analysis very well. Like in symbolic execution, we keep a symbolic state and explore different program paths to detect a non-terminating goal. When such a goal is found we can generate a class of concrete non-terminating queries using information in the moded SLD-tree.

As the similarities between symbolic execution and our work suggest, our termination prediction and non-termination analyses could be extended using ideas from symbolic execution. Using techniques from symbolic execution concerning constraint solving for example, could make big improvements in analyzing programs with integer arithmetics.



# Bibliography

- [1] Termination competition 2007. <http://www.lri.fr/~marche/termination-competition/2007>, 2007.
- [2] Tpolp: Termination prediction of logic programs. <http://users.skynet.be/fa891603/TPoLP>, 2009.
- [3] ABDENNADHER, S. Operational semantics and confluence of constraint propagation rules. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming, CP97* (1997), springer, pp. 252–266.
- [4] AGUZZI, G., AND MODIGLIANI, U. Proving termination of logic programs by transforming them into equivalent term rewriting systems. In *Proceedings of the 13th Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science* (London, UK, UK, 1993), Springer-Verlag, pp. 114–124.
- [5] APT, K. R., AND PEDRESCHI, D. Reasoning about termination of pure Prolog programs. *Information and Computation* 106 (1993), 109–157.
- [6] ARTS, T., AND ZANTEMA, H. Termination of logic programs using semantic unification. In *Logic Programming Synthesis and Transformation, 5th International Workshop, LOPSTR 95* (1996), Springer Verlag, pp. 219–233.
- [7] BOL, R. *Loop checking in logic programming*. CWI (Centre for Mathematics and Computer Science), Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1995.
- [8] BOL, R. N., APT, K. R., AND KLOP, J. W. An analysis of loop checking mechanisms for logic programs. *Theoretical Computer Science* 86, 1 (Aug. 1991), 35–79.

- [9] BOSSI, A., COCCO, N., ROSSI, S., AND ETALLE, S. On modular termination proofs of general logic programs. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 2, 3 (May 2002), 263–291.
- [10] BRUYNNOOGHE, M., CODISH, M., GALLAGHER, J. P., GENAIM, S., AND VANHOOF, W. Termination analysis of logic programs through combination of type-based norms. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)* 29, 2 (apr 2007).
- [11] BRUYNNOOGHE, M., DE SCHREYE, D., AND MARTENS, B. A general criterion for avoiding infinite unfolding during partial deduction. *New Generation Computing* 11, 1 (1992), 47–79.
- [12] BRUYNNOOGHE, M., GALLAGHER, J., AND HUMBEECK, W. V. Inference of well-typing for logic programs with application to termination analysis. In *Static Analysis, 12th International Symposium, SAS 2005* (2005), vol. 3672 of *LNCS*, Springer, pp. 35–51.
- [13] CADAR, C., AND SEN, K. Symbolic execution for software testing: Three decades later. *Commun. ACM* 56, 2 (Feb. 2013), 82–90.
- [14] CLARK, K. L. Negation as failure. In *Logic and Data Bases*, J. Minker, Ed., vol. 1. Plenum Press, New York, London, 1978, pp. 293–322.
- [15] CODISH, M. Proving termination with (boolean) satisfaction. In *The 17th International Symposium on Logic-Based Program Synthesis and Transformation, LOPSTR 2007* (2008), A. King, Ed., vol. 4915 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 1–7.
- [16] DE SCHREYE, D., AND DECORTE, S. Termination of logic programs: The never-ending story. *Journal of Logic Programming* 19/20 (1994), 199–260.
- [17] DEBRAY, S. K., LÓPEZ-GARCÍA, P., AND HERMENEGILDO, M. V. Non-failure analysis for logic programs. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Logic Programming, ICLP 1997* (1997), pp. 48–62.
- [18] DECORTE, S., DE SCHREYE, D., AND VANDECASTEELE, H. Constraint-based termination analysis of logic programs. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* 21 (1999), 1137–1195.
- [19] EÉN, N., AND SÖRENSON, N. An extensible SAT-solver. In *SAT* (2003), E. Giunchiglia and A. Tacchella, Eds., vol. 2919 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 502–518.
- [20] FRÜHWIRTH, T. Theory and practice of Constraint Handling Rules. *Journal of Logic Programming* 37, 1–3 (oct 1998), 95–138.

- [21] FRÜHWIRTH, T. Proving termination of constraint solver programs. In *Selected Papers of New Trends in Constraints, Joint ERCIM/Compulog Net Workshop* (2000), vol. 1865 of *LNCS*, Springer, pp. 298–317.
- [22] GENAIM, S., AND CODISH, M. Inferring termination conditions for logic programs using backwards analysis. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence and Reasoning* (London, UK, UK, 2001), LPAR '01, Springer-Verlag, pp. 685–694.
- [23] GIESL, J., SCHNEIDER-KAMP, P., AND THIEMANN, R. Aprove 1.2: Automatic termination proofs in the dependency pair framework. In *In Proceedings of the 3rd International Joint Conference on Automated Reasoning (IJCAR '06)* (2006), Springer-Verlag, pp. 281–286.
- [24] GIESL, J., THIEMANN, R., SWIDERSKI, S., AND SCHNEIDER-KAMP, P. Proving termination by bounded increase. In *CADE* (2007), F. Pfenning, Ed., vol. 4603 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 443–459.
- [25] INTELLIGENT SYSTEMS LABORATORY, SWEDISH INSTITUTE OF COMPUTER SCIENCE. *SICStus Prolog User's Manual*, 2002.
- [26] LEUSCHEL, M. Logic program specialisation. In *Partial Evaluation* (1998), vol. 1706 of *LNCS*, Springer, pp. 155–188.
- [27] LINDENSTRAUSS, N., AND SAGIV, Y. Automatic termination analysis of logic programs. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Logic Programming* (1997), MIT Press, pp. 63–77.
- [28] LLOYD, J. W. *Foundations of Logic Programming*, 2nd ed. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., Secaucus, NJ, USA, 1993.
- [29] LU, L. A mode analysis of logic programs by abstract interpretation. In *Ershov Memorial Conference* (1996), D. Bjørner, M. Broy, and I. V. Pottosin, Eds., vol. 1181 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 362–373.
- [30] MARCHIORI, E. Practical methods for proving termination of general logic programs. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 4, 1 (apr 1996), 179–208.
- [31] MARCHIORI, M. Proving existential termination of normal logic programs. In *Proceedings of the 5th AMAST, LNCS 1101* (1996), pp. 375–390.
- [32] MARTENS, B., AND DE SCHREYE, D. Automatic finite unfolding using well-founded measures. *Journal of Logic Programming* 28, 2 (1996), 89–146.

- [33] MESNARD, F., AND BAGNARA, R. cTI: a constraint-based termination inference tool for iso-Prolog. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 5, 1-2 (jan 2005), 243–257.
- [34] MESNARD, F., AND NEUMERKEL, U. Applying static analysis techniques for inferring termination conditions of logic programs. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Static Analysis, SAS 2001* (London, UK, UK, 2001), SAS '01, Springer-Verlag, pp. 93–110.
- [35] NGUYEN, M. T., DE SCHREYE, D., GIESL, J., AND SCHNEIDER-KAMP, P. Polytool: Polynomial interpretations as a basis for termination analysis of logic programs. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 11, 1 (2011), 33–63.
- [36] OHLEBUSCH, E., CLAVES, C., AND MARCHÉ, C. Talp: A tool for the termination analysis of logic programs. In *In Proceedings of 11th RTA, LNCS 1833* (2000), Springer-Verlag, pp. 270–273.
- [37] PAYET, E. Detecting non-termination of term rewriting systems using an unfolding operator. In *Proceedings of the 16th international conference on Logic-based program synthesis and transformation* (Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007), LOPSTR 06: International Symposium on Logic-based Program Synthesis and Transformation, Springer-Verlag, pp. 194–209.
- [38] PAYET, É., AND MESNARD, F. Nontermination inference of logic programs. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems (TOPLAS)* 28, 2 (2006), 256–289.
- [39] PILOZZI, P., AND DE SCHREYE, D. Termination analysis of chr revisited. In *ICLP (2008)*, M. G. de la Banda and E. Pontelli, Eds., vol. 5366 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 501–515.
- [40] PILOZZI, P., AND DE SCHREYE, D. Proving termination by invariance relations. In *ICLP (2009)*, P. M. Hill and D. S. Warren, Eds., vol. 5649 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 499–503.
- [41] PILOZZI, P., AND DE SCHREYE, D. Improved termination analysis of chr using self-sustainability analysis. In *LOPSTR (2011)*, G. Vidal, Ed., vol. 7225 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 189–204.
- [42] PILOZZI, P., SCHRIJVERS, T., AND DE SCHREYE, D. Proving termination of CHR in Prolog: a transformational approach. In *9th International Workshop on Termination* (2007).
- [43] RAMAKRISHNAN, I. V., RAO, P., SAGONAS, K. F., SWIFT, T., AND WARREN, D. S. Efficient access mechanisms for tabled logic programs. *Journal of Logic Programming* 38, 1 (1999), 31–54.

- [44] RAO, M. R. K. K., KAPUR, D., AND SHYAMASUNDAR, R. K. Transformational methodology for proving termination of logic programs. *Journal of Logic Programming* 34, 1 (1998), 1–41.
- [45] SAHLIN, D. Mixtus: An automatic partial evaluator for full Prolog. *New Generation Computing* 12, 1 (1993), 7–51.
- [46] SCHNEIDER-KAMP, P., GIESL, J., SEREBRENIK, A., AND THIEMANN, R. Automated termination proofs for logic programs by term rewriting. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.* 11, 1 (2009).
- [47] SCHRIJVERS, T. *Analyses, Optimizations and Extensions of Constraint Handling Rules*. PhD thesis, K.U.Leuven, Leuven, Belgium, june 2005.
- [48] SCHRIJVERS, T., AND FRÜHWIRTH, T. Optimal Union-Find in Constraint Handling Rules. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 6, 1&2 (2006).
- [49] SHEN, Y.-D. An extended variant of atoms loop check for positive logic programs. *New Generation Computing* 15 (1997), 187–204.
- [50] SHEN, Y.-D., DE SCHREYE, D., AND VOETS, D. Termination prediction for general logic programs. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 9, 6 (2009), 751–780.
- [51] SHEN, Y.-D., HUAI YOU, J., YAN YUAN, L., SHEN, S. S. P., AND YANG, Q. A dynamic approach to characterizing termination of general logic programs. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic* 4, 4 (2003), 417–430.
- [52] SHEN, Y.-D., YAN YUAN, L., AND HUAI YOU, J. Loop checks for logic programs with functions. *Theoretical Computer Science* 266 (2001), 441–461.
- [53] VAN GELDER, A. Efficient loop detection in Prolog using the tortoise-and-hare technique. *Journal of Logic Programming* 4, 1 (1987), 23–31.
- [54] VAN RAAMSDONK, F. Translating logic programs into conditional rewriting systems. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Conference on Logic Programming, ICLP 1997* (1997), pp. 168–182.
- [55] VOETS, D., AND DE SCHREYE, D. Non-termination analysis of logic programs using types. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on Logic-based program synthesis and transformation, LOPSTR 2010* (Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011), LOPSTR’10, Springer-Verlag, pp. 133–148.
- [56] VOETS, D., AND DE SCHREYE, D. Non-termination analysis of logic programs with integer arithmetics. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* 11, 4-5 (2011), 521–536.

- [57] VOETS, D., PILOZZI, P., AND DE SCHREYE, D. A new approach to termination analysis of CHR. In *Pre-Proceedings of the 18th International Symposium on Logic-Based Program Synthesis and Transformation, LOPSTR 2008* (2008), M. Hanus, Ed., pp. 28–42.
- [58] VOETS, D., AND SCHREYE, D. A new approach to non-termination analysis of logic programs. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Logic Programming, ICLP 2009* (Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009), ICLP 09: International Conference on Logic Programming, Springer-Verlag, pp. 220–234.
- [59] WIELEMAKER, J., SCHRIJVERS, T., TRISKA, M., AND LAGER, T. SWI-Prolog. *CoRR abs/1011.5332* (2010).
- [60] YARDENI, E., AND SHAPIRO, E. A type system for logic program. *Journal of Logic Programming* 10, 2 (jan 1991), 125–153.



# Biography

Dean Voets was born on the 14th of September 1985 in Lier, Belgium. He grew up in Ranst and graduated from Sint-Gabriel College Boechout in 2003. He studied Computer Science at the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven and finished the degree of Master in Computer Science in 2007. His master's thesis handled the topic of termination analysis of Constraint Handling Rules and was supervised by Professor Danny De Schreye.

In October 2007, Dean started working as a Ph.D. student at the Department of Computer Science of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. He joined the Analysis subgroup of DTAI (Declarative Languages and Artificial Intelligence) to work on Termination Analysis of Declarative Languages. His work was supervised by Professor Danny De Schreye. Dean was funded by the Fund for Scientific Research (FWO) in Flanders (Belgium).



# List of publications

## Publications in Journals

- Yi-dong Shen, Danny De Schreye, Dean Voets. Termination prediction for general logic programs. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming*, volume 9 (6), pages 751-760.
- Dean Voets, Danny De Schreye. Non-termination analysis of logic programs with integer arithmetics. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* volume 11 (4-5), pages 521-536.

## Publications at International Conferences

- Dean Voets, Paolo Pilozzi, Danny De Schreye. A new approach to termination analysis of CHR. 18th International Symposium on Logic-Based Program Synthesis and Transformation. Valencia, Spain. July 17-18, 2008. Pre-proceedings, pages 28-42.
- Dean Voets, Danny De Schreye. A New Approach to Non-termination Analysis of Logic Programs. 25th International Conference on Logic Programming. Pasadena, California, USA. July 14-17, 2009. Proceedings, pages 220-234.
- Dean Voets, Danny De Schreye. Non-termination analysis of logic programs using types. 20th international conference on Logic-based program synthesis and transformation. Hagenberg, Austria. July 23-25, 2010. Pre-Proceedings, pages 234-248.
- Dean Voets, Danny De Schreye. Non-termination analysis of logic programs using types. 20th international conference on Logic-based

program synthesis and transformation. Hagenberg, Austria. July 23-25, 2010. Proceedings, pages 133-148.

## **Publications at International Workshops**

- Dean Voets, Paolo Pilozzi, Danny De Schreye. A new approach to termination analysis of Constraint Handling Rules. 9th International Workshop on Termination. Paris, France. 29 June 2007. Proceedings, pages 26-29.
- Dean Voets, Paolo Pilozzi, Danny De Schreye. A new approach to termination analysis of Constraint Handling Rules. 4th International Workshop on Constraint Handling Rules. Porto, Portugal. 8 September 2007. Proceedings, pages 77-89.



FACULTY OF ENGINEERING SCIENCE  
DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE  
DTAI

Celestijnenlaan 200A box 2402

B-3001 Heverlee

voets.dean@gmail.com

<http://www.cs.kuleuven.be>

